

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. VI, 3.

WHOLE NO. 23.

I.—THE *S/Ṣ* AND *SA* AORISTS (6TH AND 7TH AORIST-FORMS) IN SANSKRIT.

The sibilant or sigmatic aorist, which in Greek has such an engaging uniformity, exhibits in Sanskrit, as is well known, not less than four varieties. They may, for clearness, be briefly recapitulated here.

I. (4th aorist-form.) An *s* is added to the (usually strengthened) root, to make a stem which is then inflected like any augment-preterit of the first general conjugation: thus, root *prā*, stem *prā-s*, aor. (1st persons) *a-prās-am*, *a-prās-va*, *a-prās-ma*; *a-prās-i*, *a-prās-vahi*, *a-prās-mahi*.

II. (5th aorist-form.) A vowel *i* appears before the added *s* (which then, by ordinary euphonic rule, becomes *ṣ*), and the inflection is as above: thus, root *bādh*, stem *bādh-iṣ*, aor. *a-bādhiṣ-am* etc., *a-bādhiṣ-i* etc.

III. (6th aorist-form.) Before the *iṣ* of the preceding form appears another *s*, making the aorist-sign *siṣ*; the inflection is the same: thus, root *yā*, stem *yā-siṣ*, aor. *a-yāsiṣ-am* etc., *a-yāsiṣ-i* etc.

IV. (7th aorist-form.) A sibilant immediately follows the root, but it takes an added *a*, making the aorist-sign *sa*; then the inflection is (with certain exceptions, to be pointed out below) that usual in an augment-preterit of an *a*-stem, or an imperfect of the second general conjugation: thus, root *ruk*, stem *ruk-ṣa*, aor. (3d persons) *a-rukṣa-ti*, *a-rukṣa-tām*, *a-rukṣa-n*; mid. *a-rukṣa-ta*, [*a-rukṣā-tām*,] *a-rukṣa-nta*.

Upon this peculiar state of things, and its explanation, considerable ingenuity has been expended. The object of the present paper is not primarily genetical; it is, rather, to help clear the

ground for a successful genetic explanation, by setting forth with all attainable completeness the facts of the occurrence of the *siṣ* and *sa* aorists in the Sanskrit language. It is true here, as everywhere else, that, in order to judge correctly the value of a given formation in the history of a body of related languages, one must understand its position and value in the particular language in which it appears; and for lack of attention to this rule a great deal of false linguistic history has been written. The facts in regard to these aorists were in the main given in the writer's Sanskrit Grammar; but they can now be presented with considerably greater completeness, and deserve a more detailed treatment.

It is plain, in the first place, that the two forms of sigmatic aorist here in question are quite exceptional in their occurrence, as compared with the other two. The *s*-aorist and the *iṣ*-aorist are the predominant forms, each being made from roots of every variety of phonetic character; while the other two are, even by the Hindu grammarians, restricted to special classes of roots. According to my collections,¹ there are found to occur in the whole body of the Sanskrit literature 145 *s*-aorist stems (of which 99 appear only in the older language, 9 only in the later, 37 in both), and 174 *iṣ*-aorist stems (123 in the older language, 16 in the later, 21 in both); of the other two classes, less than a score each. The details for the latter are as follows:

THE *Siṣ*-AORIST.

Personal forms of this class are made in the Veda from six roots: from three of these, in some variety; from the remaining three, only a single form each. Thus:

1. Root 2 *gā* 'sing.' From this occur in the Rig-Veda the 3d pl. act. *agāsiṣus* and the 3d sing. subj. act. *gāsiṣat*, once each. The other Vedas have nothing further; but additional forms—*agāsiṣam*, *agāsis*, *agāsiṣ*, and the augmentless *gāsiṣus*—are found throughout the Brāhmaṇas and Upanishads; the forms are common enough not to call for detailed reference. No occurrences are known to me in the Sūtras or in the later literature.

From the same root occurs twice in RV. the augmentless 1st sing. mid. *gāsi* (so understood by all the authorities), which is a form of the *s*-aorist.

¹ See my statistical work, "Sanskrit Roots, Verb-Forms, and Primary Derivatives," now just leaving the press at Leipzig.

2. Root 1 *yā* 'go.' The Rig-Veda presents a greater variety of forms from this root: *ayāsiṣam*, *dyāsiṣṭa*, *ayāsiṣus*, *yāsiṣtām* (2d du.), *yāsiṣṭa*,¹ the subj. *yāsiṣat*; and, in the middle, the precative optative *yāsiṣiṣṭhās*: they appear in all ten times. Several of the same forms occur later: e. g. *ayāsiṣam* in Brāhmaṇa, Sūtra, and epos, and *yāsiṣiṣṭhās*, repeated in two Brāhmaṇas (Taitt. S. and Kāth.); and the 3d du. *ayāsiṣtām* in three Brāhmaṇas (VS. xxviii 14, etc.) Besides, the 3d sing. *ayāsiṣ*, which (see below) might equally belong to the *s*-aorist, is found three times in RV., and also in the Brāhmaṇas, the epos, and the later language. In these later occurrences, it may plausibly be supposed to have been, in the estimation of those who used it, a *siṣ*-aorist form; but in RV. it has beside it the unmistakable *s*-aorist forms *ayāsam* and *dyāsus*, and the subj. *yāsat* (also TB. ii 8.3^o); so that its classification there is a matter of doubt.

3. Root 1 *hā* 'leave.' No *siṣ*-forms from this root occur in the Rig-Veda; but in the Atharvan they are found 8 times: namely, *hāsiṣtam*, *-ṣṭām*, *-ṣṭa*, *-ṣus*. The 1st sing., also augmentless, *hāsiṣam*, shows itself in half a dozen Brāhmaṇas and in the epos, as do some of the AV. forms. The forms of doubtful classification, *ahāsis* and *ahāsiṣ* and the same without augment, are quotable in a few occurrences, from the AV. all the way down to the classical language; and beside them not only RV. puts the plain *s*-aorist forms *ahās*, *hās*, *hāsus*, but the epos has once *ahāsma* (MBh. v. 3425).

4. The secondary root *pyā*, from *pi* or *pī* 'fill up, be fat' (pres. *pyāyate* etc.), which is found in use from the Rig-Veda down, makes the solitary *siṣ*-form *pyāsiṣimahi*. This occurs once in the Atharvan (the MSS, however, reading *pyāciṣ*-), and also in a phrase (*vardhiṣimahi ca vayām ā ca pyāsiṣimahi*) which is repeated in several Brāhmaṇa and Sūtra texts (VS. ii 14; xxxviii 21: ÇGS. ii 10; ÇÇS. i 12.12). Āpastamba (iii 4.6), however, reads in the same formula *pyāyiṣimahi*, an *iṣ*-aorist form of a variety that is not without its parallels elsewhere.

5. Root *ram* 'be gratified.' This root is one of the three ending in a nasal ("*nam*, *yam*, and *ram*") from which the Hindu grammarians allow the *siṣ*-aorist to be made. Hence *aramsiṣ*, occurring once in the drama (Utt. Rām.), is doubtless best to be referred hither, rather than to the *s*-aorist, from which come in the

¹ The long *ī* in this form is without parallel elsewhere; and the metre of the quarter-verse is so wrong that a corrupt reading may be suspected.

Veda the (middle) forms *raṁsthās*, *araṁsta*, *araṁsata*. The only unmistakable *siṣ*-form met with is *raṁsiṣam*, given once by the Sāma-Veda (i 310), as variant for Rig-Veda (vii 32.18) *rāsiya* (the SV. version of the line is shown by its spoiled metre to be a corruption).

6. Root *van* 'win.' The Atharva-Veda has twice (ix 1.14; xvi 9.4) *vaṇṇiṣiṣya*, which, beyond all question, is to be emended to *vaṇsiṣiṣya*, and referred to this root (the substitution of *ç* for *ṣ* in the Atharvan manuscripts is by no means uncommon). That the Hindu grammar does not permit a *siṣ*-aorist from this root is a matter of no moment. From the same root are made in the Veda both *s*-aorist and *iṣ*-aorist forms; and it exhibits an unusual variety of "precative" formations: namely, besides *vaṇsiṣiṣya*, also *vaṇiṣiṣṭa* and *vaṇsimahi* and *vasimahi* (all in RV.).

This is the whole Vedic material.

7. Root *jñā* 'know.' This root makes *s*-aorist forms, both active (*ajñāsam*) and middle (*ajñāsthās*), in the Atharva-Veda and in more than one of the Brāhmaṇas. But also, beginning with the latter class of writings, it has a *siṣ*-aorist, of which, owing to the frequency of the root in use, a number of forms are quotable: namely, *ajñāsiṣam*, *-sīt*, *-siṣma*, *-siṣṭa*, and the augmentless *jñāsiṣam*, *-ṣus*; they are found a few times also in the epic and classical literature.

From any other root, only sporadic forms are made. Thus:

8. Root *jyā* 'overpower.' The form *ajyāsiṣṭām* (3d du.) appears to occur in the Brāhmaṇas: namely, in Pañc. Br. xxi 1 (where, however, both text and comment have in the published edition the absurd reading *ijyāsiṣṭām*) and Jāim. Br. ii 249 (a corresponding passage: the manuscript reads *ajjāsiṣṭām*).

9. Root *dhyā* 'think.' A single form, *adhyaṣiṣam* (but the edition reads *adhāsiṣam*), occurs once in the Çat. Br., at VI, ii 1.7.

10. Root *bhuj* 'enjoy.' The very exceptional form *bhukṣiṣiṣya* appears in a phrase (*tan mām avatu tan mā viçatu tena bhukṣiṣiṣya*) which is found at the beginning of the Pañc. Br. (i 1), and also in Āpastamba (x 1.4) and Āçv. Grh. Sū. (i 23.19). If we met with *bhakṣiṣiṣya*, we should call it an *iṣ*-aorist form from the secondary root *bhakṣ*, from *bhaj*; but there are no other signs of a secondary root *bhukṣ*.

Along with this may be mentioned also the solitary Rig-Veda word *ākṣiṣus* (i 163.10), which is related to root 1 *aç* very much as *bhukṣiṣiṣya* to *bhuj*, and which Grassmann puts under 1 *aç*, while I

have preferred to refer it to the secondary root १ *akṣ*, since there are other forms which call for the assumption of such a root.

11. Root *mnā* 'mention.' The Nirukta (i 20) has once *amnā-siṣus*.

From the other roots to be mentioned, no forms are made which might not equally well be derived from the *s*-aorist stem. In the 2d and 3d sing. active, namely, the forms of the *s*-aorist and the *siṣ*-aorist, according to the later usages of the language, are identical. Thus, for example :

<i>ayāsam</i>	}	<i>ayāsīs</i>	<i>ayāsīt</i>	{	<i>ayāsva</i> etc.	<i>ayāsma</i> etc.
<i>ayāsiṣam</i>					<i>ayāsiṣva</i> etc.	<i>ayāsiṣma</i> etc.

As is pointed out in my Sanskrit Grammar, however (§§ 888-90: I had, so far as I know, been the first to call attention to the fact, and classify the resulting forms correctly, in the Proceedings of the Am. Oriental Soc. for May, 1876; Journ. Am. Or. Soc., Vol. X, p. cxxv), the earliest language had no such 2d and 3d singulars from the *s*-stem, but made in both, *e. g.*, *ayās* (for *ayās-s* and *ayās-t*); forms with the inserted *i* begin to appear in the Atharva-Veda and the Brāhmaṇas, and become gradually prevalent, and then exclusively used. If any aorist-forms in *sīs* and *sīt*, then, occurred in the Rig-Veda (as is not the case), made from roots which are allowed, or later exhibit, the *siṣ*-formation, we should have to refer them to the *siṣ*-aorist; in the Brāhmaṇas and later, the classification is in every case questionable; but with a presumption in favor of the *s*-aorist in the older language, and in favor of the *siṣ*-aorist in the later.

12-14. Forms of this doubtful character (besides those already mentioned) are quotable from only three roots in the older language: they are *adrāsīt* Kāth. (xxviii 4), *avāsīt* Çat. Br. (X, iii 3.8) and Jām. Up. Br. (2), and *ahvāsīt* Gop. Br. (i 3.4). In none of these cases are there found further aorist-forms to help determine their reference to the one aorist or to the other.

15-19. The remaining single forms, found in the later language only, and therefore referable without much question to the *siṣ*-aorist, are *glāsīs* MBh., *adhmasīt* Hariv., *anaṁsīt* Çiçup., *apāsīt* Rāj. Tar., *mlāsīs* MBh.

To sum up: Forms referable with more or less certainty to the *siṣ*-aorist are quotable in Sanskrit from 19 roots: in the oldest language (Rig-Veda) from 2 only; in the later Veda and Brāhmaṇa, from only 2 in more than single sporadic forms, from 6 others in

single forms of unquestionable character, and 3 of questionable; finally, single examples from 6 roots in the later language alone, the forms of only one of them unquestionable. Only 3 roots show forms both in the earlier and in the later language.

What is to be inferred from these facts does not, to my mind, admit of any reasonable question. The first *s* of the tense-sign *siṣ* is an adscititious sibilant added to the root—from which, then, as thus increased, the ordinary *iṣ*-aorist is made. No reduplication of a combined auxiliary, or anything else of an organic character, is plausibly to be seen in it. Yet there is probably an identity of origin between the two sibilants. That is to say, the adscititious sibilant is most likely to be the aoristic *s* itself: an *s*-aorist stem has been made the starting-point of a new quasi-radical formation. Roots of a secondary character with final sibilant are far from rare in Sanskrit. It has been usual to regard some of them as of "desiderative" origin; and doubtless with good reason; but, apart from the probable identity of origin between the desiderative and the aoristic *s*, there are many cases where any characteristic of desiderative formation is wanting. One has to admit in the Veda a root-form *rās* beside *rā* 'give'; and it is obviously a development from the *s*-aorist formation. In like manner, beside *hā* stands *hās*, which has a so far differentiated character as to be reckoned a separate root. So *bhās* appears to be similarly related to *bhā*. These are the examples of most value, because of their relation to the class of roots (ending in *ā*) from which the *siṣ*-aorists especially come. As regards roots with final consonants, the cases of *bhukṣiṣiṣya* and *ākṣiṣus* have been already commented on. To go through the list of roots with final sibilant, and discuss their character, would take us too far, and belongs to a special inquiry, directed to another end than the one now in view. But the cases already referred to, taken in connection with the sporadic nature of the whole *siṣ*-aorist formation, are enough to settle the question as to the probable derivation of the latter.

THE *Sa*-AORIST.

We will take up the roots making forms of this aorist nearly in the order of the frequency of the forms.

1. Root *duh* 'milk, draw forth.' The Rig-Veda forms from this root are quite numerous and of considerable variety. It will be enough simply to enumerate them here. Active, *ddhukṣat*, *ddhukṣan*,

dhukṣan; and, with *d* instead of the regular *dh*, *adukṣat*, *dukṣas*, *dukṣān*: middle, *ddhukṣata*, *dhukṣata* (accent !), *dhukṣānta*, *dhukṣāsva*; and *dukṣata*: the whole number of occurrences is seventeen. It may be remarked that the forms are more than once (i 33.10; x 149.1) used with the value of an imperfect; and that the whole formation appears to verge upon that of a secondary conjugation, with secondary root-form *dukṣ* or *dhukṣ*. The Atharva-Veda adds nothing to this material. But in the Brāhmaṇas appear *adhukṣas* (Çat. Br. I, vii 1.17, and the same phrase in Mait. S., and nearly the same in Āpast. i 13.3) and *adhukṣan* Taitt. S. ii 5.3³⁴, both distinctly aoristic in value; and then, in the later language, Bhāg. Pur. has *adhukṣan* (iv 18.17, 23).

Of forms of the *s*-aorist (middle), the Rig-Veda shows *adhukṣata* (3d pl.), and the Bhāg. Pur. has the same (at iv 18.18); and *dhukṣimādhī* is found in Taitt. S. i 6.4³ (and the corresponding passage in Mait. S.), and Kāth. xix 13.

2. Root *mṛj* 'wipe.' According to the Hindu grammarians, this root has no right to make a *sa*-aorist, the privilege being limited to roots ending in *ç* or *ṣ* or *h*. In fact, however, more *sa*-forms come from it in the older language than from any other root excepting *duh*. In the Rig-Veda we find, of active forms, *amṛkṣāma* and *mṛkṣatam* (2 du. impv.); of middle, *amṛkṣanta*: the occurrences are five. In the Brāhmaṇa and Sūtra language, we have *amṛkṣat* in Kāth. xxxv 3 (*bis*), and Āpast. ix 17.4 (rather from *mṛç*?), and *mṛkṣam* and *mṛkṣas* in several texts: *e. g.* Taitt. S. i 1.10¹; Ait. Br. iii 8.3. In the later language, *amṛkṣata* (3d sing.) in the Mahābh. (xiii 1486) is referred in the Petersburg lexicon both to *mṛj* and to *mṛkṣ*, with hesitating preference for the latter—which we may perhaps best share.

3. Root *mṛç* 'feel of, touch.' A *sa*-aorist identical in form with the preceding is in use from this root also. The Rig-Veda has *mṛkṣas* and *mṛkṣata* (2d pl.), each once; and the Atharvan has *amṛkṣat* once. The only other form I am able to quote is *amṛkṣas*, in the Mahābh. (iii 1369).

4. Root *ruh* 'ascend.' For this root I can quote forms only from the older language. In Rig-Veda occurs once *arukṣat*. The Atharvan has *arukṣas*, *-ṣat*, *-sāma*, and the augmentless *rukṣas*; and *arukṣat*, *-ṣan* are found in several of the Brāhmaṇas (*e. g.* Çat. Br. XII, iv 2.7; Mait. S. i 6.13), and *rukṣata* in Jaim. Br. iii 152. The only other aorist formation from this root is the *a*-aorist, *aruham* *-he*, etc., and it is found occurring in all periods of the language.

5. Root *spṛṣ* 'touch.' Examples are quotable for this root also only from the earlier language: the Atharvan has *asprṛkṣat* once; and the same form, and *asprṛkṣas*, -*ṣan*, are quotable from three different Brāhmaṇas (e. g. Vāj. S. vi 2; xxviii 18,20). An example or two of the *s*-aorist, *asprākṣam* and *sprākṣis*, are met with in the Brāhmaṇa and epos.

6. Root *vrh* 'tear out.' From this root occur *avṛkṣāma* Tāitt. Br. i 5.2^o, and *avṛkṣat* Jām. Br. i 188, in connections which make their reference to it wholly clear; *sam-avṛkṣat* in Māit. S. i 8.9 (*bis*) also belongs here (although, in my conspectus of forms, I put it under *vrj*); but *avṛkṣam* in Rig-Veda x 159.5 is perhaps best put under root *vrj*, with Grassmann and the Petersburg lexicon, although its being active makes the case very questionable.

7. Root *vrj* 'twist.' The doubtful Rig-Veda form *avṛkṣam*, just spoken of, is the only one quotable for this root. As we were obliged to admit *sa*-forms from *mrj*, above, we need not hesitate here also to acknowledge one as coming from a root in final *j*. The other aorist forms of *vrj* are of the root-aorist and the *s*-aorist; they occur both in Veda and in Brāhmaṇa texts.

8. Root *dviṣ* 'be hostile.' This root furnishes only in the Atharva-Veda the two augmentless forms *dviṣat* act., and *dviṣata* mid., the former in a single passage, the latter in a phrase (*mā' no dviṣata kḍḍ cand*) which is repeated several times. No other aorist forms from it occur.

9. Root *kṛṣ* 'draw.' Here, too, we have both an active and a middle form: *akṛṣat* in Māit. S. i 10.17 (and Kāth.); *akṛṣathās* in Çat. Br. XI, vii 2.2. No other aorist forms are met with (excepting the causative).

10. Root *kruṣ* 'cry out.' Here occur *akruṣas* Çat. Br. XI, iv 2.19, and *akruṣat* Rig-Veda x 146.4. No other aorist forms.

11. Root *guh* 'hide.' Two active forms: *aghukṣat* Rig-Veda v 40.8; *aghukṣatām* Tāitt. S. ii 2.1'. In RV. certain *a*-aorist forms are also made.

12. Root *diṣ* 'point.' The form *adikṣat* occurs once in the Çat. Br. (III, iii 3.11), and twice in the later language (Daçak.). *S*-aorist forms occur in RV.

13. Root *viṣ* 'enter.' The form *avikṣat* occurs five times in Çat. Br. (e. g. II, iii 4.2), and once in the Rāj. Tar. Forms of several other kinds of aorist are met with.

14-19. For the remaining roots, only single occurrences have been noted, as follows: From *druh* 'hate,' *adrukṣas* Ait. Br. viii

23.10: also *a*- and *s*-aorist forms. From *piṣ* 'crush,' *apikṣan* Çat. Br. IV, i 5.5. From *mih* 'mingere,' *amikṣat* Çat. Br. III, ii 2.21. From *lih* 'lick,' *alikhṣat* Āpast. ix 17.5. From *dr̥ṣ* 'see,' I have noted *dr̥kṣam* Kāth. i 10, but am unable to verify its correctness: various other aorists from this root occur. Finally, from *dih* 'smear,' the mongrel form *adhikṣus* (it ought to be either *adhikṣan* as *sa*-aorist, or *adhāikṣus* as *s*-aorist) is once met with, at Jāim. Br. i 121 (see Proc. Am. Or. Soc. for May, 1883, or Journ. Am. Or. Soc., Vol. XI, p. cxlv). The apparently anomalous form *avṛtsan*, Bhāg. Pur. v 9.8 (Burnouf's edition), is a mis-reading for *avṛtsata*.

It may be worth while to put together here the few middle forms: they are, in the Rig-Veda, *dukṣata*, *ddhukṣata*, *dhukṣata* (should be *dhukṣāta*?), *dhukṣānta*, *dhukṣāsva*, *amṛkṣanta*; in the Atharva-Veda, *dvikṣata*; in the Çatapatha-Brahmana, *akṛkṣathās*. Of the active inflection, all the forms can be instanced (with or without augment) except the 1st dual; but some of them only by a single example.

The whole *sa*-aorist formation, it thus clearly appears, is in just about the same degree sporadic in its character as is the *siṣ*-aorist. It shows itself, altogether, in the same number of roots as the latter. Except from half a dozen roots, it occurs only in a scattering form or two, and in the Rig-Veda it is made with any freedom from two roots only. It is limited to roots having such a final consonant as combines regularly with the sibilant to *kṣ*, and having *i* or *u* or *r̥* as medial vowel. All these things are indicative of an inorganic formation, fortuitously started, and carried but a little way in its development. If we had the middle forms alone to deal with, we should not hesitate to pronounce them mere cases of the transfer of *s*-aorist forms to the mode of inflection of *a*-stems—such as appear abundantly elsewhere, both in conjugation and in declension. According to the Hindu grammarians (to whose teachings in such a case, where there appears no reason to the contrary, we may yield a guarded acceptance), the *sa*-forms are not made in the 1st sing. and 2d and 3d du. middle, but the *s*-forms are used instead—this would mean that in those persons no transfer chances to be made. Unluckily, not one of the three forms is quotable in the literature from a root having its aorist of the *sa*-formation. The Rig-Veda, to be sure, has once *adikṣi*; but, to show that this is not corresponding 1st sing. mid. to *adikṣat*, it has also *adiṣṭa*. So, too, it has once *vṛkṣi*, but beside it *avṛkta*:

this might, indeed, be root-aorist (Grassmann so classes it, on account of *avr̥k* and *avr̥jan*); but we find *avr̥kṣmahi*, an unmistakable *s*-aorist form, in the Jāiminiya-Brāhmaṇa (ii 363). Whether, however, we shall be justified in definitively calling the middle *sa*-forms simple transfers, must depend on what explanation we can find for the active forms. As regards the latter, the difficulty in the way of accepting the theory of transfer is obviously the character of the root-vowel, which in the *s*-aorist has the second or *vṛddhi* degree of strengthening, while in the *sa*-forms it is weak: *adāikṣam* as 1st person would by no means make by analogy *adikṣas* etc.—as for example, *agamam* has made *agamas* etc.; and so in numerous other cases. This appears at present an insurmountable obstacle. But it may not always continue so, when once the question of origin of the active strengthening is settled. In all the active subjunctives of the *s*-aorist, we see only first or *guṇa* strengthening, instead of *vṛddhi*; and that even this is of secondary origin in the history of the tense may be conjecturally inferred from its absence in the middle.

At any rate, all signs appear to me to point toward an accidental origin for the scattering persons of this aorist, and so to shut out the whole formation from any important part in the investigation of the history of the sigmatic aorist. The analogy, indeed, of *ddikṣam* and *ἰδεῖξα*, which has given such satisfaction to beginners in comparative philology, and seemed to explain so much, has a deal of fallacy about it. The true analogue of *ddikṣam* would be *ἰδεῖξον*; we have in the Sanskrit only the ordinary *a*-inflection, with no element at all corresponding to the fixed *a* of the Greek; and we have the weakest form of root-vowel.

There remain, then, as the true factors in Sanskrit with which we have to work in studying the genesis of the sigmatic aorist, the *s*-aorist and the *iṣ*-aorist, and these alone. In respect to the sibilant, and to its occurrence without or with a preceding *i* (even to the isolated exception of the long *ī* of root *grah*), this aorist-formation agrees with the *s*-future and with the desiderative. Until good evidence to the contrary can be shown, these three must be regarded as related formations; and no explanation can be accepted as satisfactory for one of them which does not apply also to the others.

W. D. WHITNEY.

JULY, 1885.

II.—REMARKS ON VOL. II OF KOCK'S COMICORUM ATTICORUM FRAGMENTA.

Antiphanes, fr. 129, 4:

θύνης τὰ πρὸς τῆς ποια τὰ κάτωθεν λέγω.

Perhaps προστηθίδια.

Fr. 171, 2:

ἀποπνίξεις δέ με καινὴν πρὸς με διάλεκτον λαλῶν.

For δε I would read ἤδη.

Fr. 190, 5:

ἄνδρες πάλοι ὀψοφάγοι τοιοῦτοί τινες.

Probably ᾤ. παλαιοψοφάγοι τοιοῦτοί τινες. The second syllable of παλαιός is not unfrequently short in Attic (L. and S.)

Fr. 194, 15-19:

πίνῃ καὶ τρίγλῃ φωνὰς ἰχθὺ δὺ' ἔχουσai
πάλλ' ἐλάλουν, περὶ ὧν δὲ πρὸς ὧν τ' ᾔοντο λέγειν τι
οὐκ ἐλάλουν· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐμάνθανεν, ὥστε πρὸς ὧν μὲν
ἦν αὐταῖς ὁ λόγος, πρὸς δ' αὐτὰς πολλὰ λαλούσας
αὐτὰς ἀμφοτέρως ἢ Δημήτηρ ἐπιτρίψει.

Whatever may be the meaning of this riddle, the construction of the whole is sufficiently intelligible to make conjecture unnecessary. 'The pinna and the mullet, two fishes endowed with speech, held a long conversation, but not on the matters nor to the ears of him they fancied they were addressing; for he understood nothing they said, so that whereas they address their conversation to him, they were talking at much length to each other, and shall receive both of them in person (αὐτὰς) the punishment of Demeter.' Reading with Casaubon ἐπιτρίψει.

Fr. 195, 3:

τοιουτοσί τίς εἰμι, τύπτεσθαι μύδρος,
τύπτειν κεραυνός, ἐκτυφλοῦν τιν' ἀστραπή,
φέρειν τιν' ἄρας ἄνεμος, ἀποπνίξαι βρόχος,
θύρας μοχλεῦεν σεισμός, εἰσπηδᾶν ἀκρίς,
δειπνεῖν ἀκλητος μνία, μὴ' ἐλθεῖν φρέαρ.

To this and a similarly bizarre list of comparisons in Aristophon (fr. 10 Kock) a well-known passage of Apollinaris Sidonius, certainly a great admirer of Menander (Epist. IV 9), and probably of Greek comedy in general, forms a good parallel. Epist. V 7: *In foro Scythae, in cubiculo uiperæ, in conuiuio scurrae, in exactionibus harpyiae, in colloctionibus statuæ, in quaestionibus bestiae, in tractatibus cocleæ, in contractionibus trapezitæ, ad intelligendum saxei, ad iudicandum ignei, ad succensendum flammei, ad ignoscendum ferrei, ad amicitias pardi, ad facetias ursi, ad fallendum uulpes, ad superbiendum tauri, ad consumendum minotauri.*

Fr. 215:

κομψός γε μικρὸς κρωμακίσκος οὐτοσί
γαλαθηνός.

Kock justly denies that κρωμακίσκος can be the right word. Nauck's κωραλίσκος and Kock's γρυλακίσκος are neither of them so near the original as κρωκαλίσκος, a word which may well have existed by the side of κρωκαλέον παιδίον πανούργων and κρόκαλον τὸ πανούργων παιδίον, both in Hesychius.

Fr. 234:

σφαῖραν λαβὼν
τῷ μὲν διδόντι ἔχαιρε, τὸν δ' ἔφευγ' ἄμα,
τοῦ δ' ἐξέκρουσε, τὸν δ' ἀνέστησεν πάλιν,
κλαγκταῖσι φωναῖς.
ἔξω, μακράν, παρ' αὐτόν, ὑπὲρ αὐτόν, κάτω,
ἄνω, βραχεῖαν ἀπόδοσιν ἐγκαταστρέφει.

For ἐξέκρουσε I suggest ἐξεκρούσθη, the opposite of ἀνέστησεν, 'by one he was pushed out of the way, another (who had fallen) he picked up again.' In the last line by reading after Porson καταστρέφει, we get a tolerable construction and a sense justified by Sidonius' special use of *catastrophæ*. II 5: *Et ecce huc sphaeristarum contrastantium paria inter rotatiles catastropharum gyros duplicabantur.* V 17: *per catastropham saepe pronatus aequæ de ruinoso flexu se recolligeret.* 'He turns round with (i. e. to give) a short and sharp return of the ball.' The active is quite intelligible, as identifying the movement of turning round with the giving back of the ball.

Fr. 329. Iuuen. VI 460: *Intolerabilius nihil est quam femina diues.*

Eubulus, fr. 15: 9. παρεγκέκασται στεραν' ἐννέ' ἢ δέκα.

Possibly *περνί* if we may suppose pieces of heel to have been sometimes served as a dish.

Fr. 37, 2:

αἷ τε λιμνοσώματοι
βοιώται παρῆσαν ἐγγέλεις θεῶν
τεῦτλ' ἀμπεχόμεναι.

Kock seems to rightly reject *λιμνοσώματοι*. Can the word be *ελισσώματοι*, 'wriggling-bodied'? Compare *ελισόκερως*.

Fr. 105:

Αἰγίδιον, σὺ δὲ τόνδε φορήσεις
στέφανον πολυποίκιλον ἀνθέων
γρυπώτατον, χαριέστατον, ὦ Ζεῦ.
τίς γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔχουσα φιλήσει;

τίς ἄρ' seems a plausible correction.

Fr. 107, 10:

ἀπτελεβόφθαλμος μὴ πρόστομος ἀμφικέφαλος.

In this description of the ichneumon, the facts of the animal's natural history seem to demand Casaubon's emendation *μικρόστομος*, as the ichneumon's snout is at once small and markedly pointed. Meineke reads *ἀμφικέφαλος*, 'double-headed,' explaining of the tail having some resemblance to the head. May not the idea be rather that of the ichneumon rolling its body into a ball and meeting its tail with its head? Unless, indeed, we read *ἀμφικνέφαλος* (see Schmidt on Hesych. s. v. *ἀμφικέφαλος*) and interpret of the *soft woolly surface* of each end of the ichneumon's body? The idea would, I think, still be of the head turning round in a posture of rest towards the tail, *each end* thus presenting a nappy surface. So Nicander Ther. 204: *πηλῶ ἀλινθηθεῖς ὀλίγον δέμας, εἰσόκε λάχυνην Σείριος ἀζήνη*.

Fr. 115. Compare with this Martial VII 87: *Si meus aurila gaudet lagalopece Flaccus*. The pets of Eubulus are the goose, sparrow and ape: Martial's are the lap-dog, long-tailed ape, ichneumon, magpie, snake, nightingale, and lagalopex.

Nicostratus, fr. 17:

ὅς μέλανα ποιεῖν ζωμὸν οὐκ ἡπίστατο
θρίον δὲ καὶ κἀνδανλον ἢ τούτων τι τῶν
εἰς ματτύην οὐδέτερον εἶδε πώποτε.

I fancy that *οὐδέτερον* is used here in its grammatical sense 'a neuter.' Reading then *εἶδ' οὐπώποτε*, I would translate, 'and who never yet

set his eyes on an omelette or Lydian ragout or any of the neuters we see served up to make a dainty dish.' It is no doubt true that *κάνδαυλος* is not known to exist as a neuter: but this with *θρίον* preceding and the number of well-known neuter words, such as *όξωτόν*, *σιλφιωτόν*, etc. (Aristoph. fr. 130 Kock), which would occur to an Athenian, need occasion no difficulty.

Ephippus, fr. 13:

χόνδρος, τυρός,
μέλι, σησαμίδες, βράχος βρυγμός.

Possibly *βρόγχος*, *βρυγμός*, 'to gulp or nibble.'

Anaxilas, fr. 22, 25:

εἴτα τετράπους μοι γένοιτο, φησί, τήνπρος ἢ θρόνος,
εἴτα δὴ τρίπους τις, εἴτα, φησί, παιδίσκη δίπους.

For *τήνπρος* I conjecture *τίβηνος*, a word for 'pan' or 'bath,' in which sense Lycophron applies it, in the form *τιβήν*, to the bath in which Agamemnon was killed (Alexand. 1104). Hesych. *τίβηνος*. *λέβης τρίπους*. That its having three feet is no essential part of its meaning is clear from another gloss of Hesych. *θίβηνος* (*θίβωνος* MS) *κίβωτος*, *Κύπριοι*, and the side forms *ιβηνοί* *κίβωτοί*, and *ιβην σορόν*. It was a Cyprian word, used by the Greeks with the perfectly distinct meanings of 'pan' or 'box.' It is in the latter sense that it would best suit here, where the *εταίρα* is expressing the various articles she would be glad to receive from her admirers. The rare dactyl in trochaic tetrameter would be justifiable as falling under the excepted class of proper names; but if this is thought improbable, *φῆσ' ἰβηνος* would tolerably explain the corrupt *φησι τήνπρος* of MSS.

Alexis, fr. 2:

ἀπῆντων τῷ ξένῳ,
εἰς τὴν κατάλυσιν ἡσονην αἰθων ἀνὴρ.

Read

εἰς τὴν κατάλυσιν ἦκον· ἦν αἰθων ἀνὴρ.

'I was a man of rapid action,' as is immediately shown by the next words, *τοῖς παισὶ τ' εἶπα*, I ordered the slaves to produce the cups.

Fr. 62:

τέτταρας
περιστερὰς ἀφήκεν ἀποβεβαμμένας
εἰς οὐχὶ ταῦτόν μὰ Δία τὴν αὐτὴν μύρον,
ἰδίῳ δ' ἐκάστην.

G. A. Hirschig ap. Kock conjectured *τὰς πάσας* for *τὴν αὐτὴν*. I

believe τὴν αὐτὴν to be right, 'in the same way,' like τὴν ἄλλως τὴν πρῶτην τὴν ταχίστην τὴν εὐθείαν, etc.

Fr. 116:

Δύ' ἐστί, Ναυσίτικε, παρασίτων γένη,
ἐν μὲν τὸ κοινὸν καὶ κεκωμωδημένον,
οἱ μέλανες ἡμεῖς * θάτερον ζητῶ γένος,
σεμνοπαράσιτον ἐκ μέσου καλούμενον,
σατράπας παρασίτους καὶ στρατηγούς ἐπιφανεῖς.

Alexis contrasts here two classes of parasites, the ordinary type of the comic stage, wearing the traditional black robe of their profession (Poll. 4, 119), and the special or extraordinary, the grandees of the order. The former class might be called ἐν μέσῳ, public or familiar to all: the latter is ἐκ μέσου, 'apart from the mass,' 'special.' There is no need to alter this either with Herwerden into ἐμμέτρως, still less with Kock into ἐν μέσῳ.

Fr. 155:

οὗτος πρότερον κεφαλὴν εἰ λάβοι θύνον.

Probably κεφαλὴν γὰρ εἰ θύνον λάβοι.

Fr. 172:

ἐπὰν . . .
δίπυρον παραθήσεις ὧν ἐπιτετμημένον
πυόν, μέλιτος ὀξύβαφον, ἀποταγνιῶ.

This fragment is imperfect, no doubt, but it seems very clear that the subjunctive required by ἐπὰν is παραθῆς. If this is so, εἰς may be ἴσ' constructed with ἐπιτετμημένον, 'sliced in equal pieces,' Martial's *divisum ouum*.

Fr. 187:

τὸ δ' ἄλλο σῶμα (of the cuttle-fish) κατατεμὼν πολλοὺς κύβους
σμήσας τε λεπτοῖς ἀλαί, δειπνούντων ἅμα
ἐπὶ τὸ τάγηνον σίζον ἐπεισιῶν φέρω.

Rather ἐπὶ τοῦ ταγήνου σίζον ἐπισείων (so Meineke) φέρω. 'The rest of the body I cut up into a number of squares, then add a sprinkling of salt, and before they have ended what they are eating, carry it hissing hot on the frying-pan, giving it an extra toss.'

Fr. 200:

πῶς ποτ' οὐχὶ πλούσιοι
ἅπαντές εἰσι λαμβάνοντες βασιλικούς
φόρους * μόνον οὐχὶ δεκατεύουσι γὰρ
τὰς οὐσίας ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν καθήμενοι.

I suspect the word which has fallen out after φόρους is δεκάτων.

Fr. 234:

ποιητικούς ἱταμούς προθύμους εὐπόρους
ἐν τοῖς ἀπόροις βλέποντας ἀθλιωτάτους

ἀνδρικωτάτους, or possibly ἀνδρικώτατα, seems not to have been conjectured.

Fr. 267. For ὅθεν ὁ πρῶτος we should perhaps read ὅθενπερ οὗτος. Clearchus, fr. 1:

τὴν δ' ἐγὼ
μεστὴν ἅπασαν ἐπονομάσας προπίομαι
πίστωμα φιλίας συγγενέσι.

I see no reason for altering ἅπασαν, with Dobree, to ἀπαξ. It is at least equally probable that ἐπομόσας, 'first adding an oath to my bumper,' is the vitiated word. The passage of Cratinus (fr. 273 Kock) in which ἐπονομάζειν is used of a lover mentioning while drinking the name of the loved object proves nothing for the passage of Clearchus, even if ἐπονομάσας could be considered (which surely is impossible) equivalent to ἐπονομάζων.

Axionicus, fr. 2:

οἶνος οὐκ ἔνεστιν αὐ
ῥυτοῖς, πρὸς ἐταίρους πρόφασιν ἐπὶ κῶμόν τινα
ὅπερ ποιεῖν εἴωθε Γρυλλίων ἀεὶ.

So I would write and punctuate this passage. The best MS of Athenaeus gives ἔνεστιν αὐτοῖς. 'Besides there is no wine in the spirting-horns, and this is what Gryllion always challenges his friends to do, as a pretext for going to the revel.' The sense I suppose to be that Gryllion, when he wanted to break up a drinking party, introduced ῥυτὰ as a preliminary, which was understood to mean that the next thing would be leaving the party and going off to the κῶμος.

Dionysius, fr. 2:

27 μὴ πάντ' ἄκουε μηδὲ πάντα μάνθανε,
τῶν βυβλίων ὅσ' ἔνεστι κατα γεγραμμένα.
κενὰ μᾶλλον ἢ οἷς ἦν οὐδέπω γεγραμμένα.
30 οὐδ' ἔστιν εἰπεῖν περὶ μαγειρικῆς· ἐπεὶ
εἰπ' ἄρτιως
ὅρον γὰρ οὐκ ἔσχηκεν, οὗ καιρὸς [μακράν].

So I would write this passage. In 28 ἔνεστι is suggested by Kock's ἐστὶ. The MS has ἔσθ' ἕνεκα τὰ γε. 'Do not listen to everything

nor learn everything that the books (on cookery) contain, written and registered. They are emptier than such as never yet had anything written in them. It is not possible to prescribe rules about cookery; for such rules have lately found an exponent. Cookery has never admitted of definition, in which 'the opportune moment' has no part.' That is, cookery is an art in which accident and doing the thing at the right moment, and with the proper adjustment of the circumstances require, is of more consequence than rules.

Heniochus, fr. 2:

ὁ δ' ἴσως γαλαθηνόν τέθυκε τὸν χοῖρον λαβόν.

May not the ἴσως here be condensed for ἴσως ὥς, 'as good as,' *i. e.* not much older than a sucking pig, and therefore not tough, nor requiring any long time to roast? Similarly tentative is the explanation I would offer of Sotades, I 31, 32:

τεμὼν δὲ λεπτήν τῆς χλόης καὶ πλείονα

κἂν ἢ δικτύλος λήκυθος καταστρέφω.

λεπτήν *sc.* τομήν, 'after cutting the green stuff small I upset over it a flask of oil, it might be two cotylafuls, it might be more.'

Timocles, fr. 39: The Hesychian gloss ἀπυξίνος· ἀπονεύρ . . . is ἀπεξίνοι· ἀπονευροῖ, I think, rather than ἀπεξίνου· ἀπενεύρου.

Xenarchus, fr. 1:

φθίνει δόμος

ἀσυνστάτοισι δεσποτῶν κεχρημένος

τύχαις, ἀλάστωρ τ' εἰσπέπαικε Πελοπιδῶν.

ἄστυτος οἶκος.

In spite of the tragic cast of this fragment, which is obviously meant as a parody either of Euripides or some other dramatist, I cannot believe that Blomfield is right in reading ἀσυνστάτοισι. On the other hand Herwerden's ἀσυντάτοισι is open to the objection that neither it nor σύντατος are known to exist, whilst the ἀνετάτοισι of Kock is somewhat wide of the MS tradition. ἀσυνστάτοισι I hold to be a mere error for ἀσυντοστάτοισι, a superlative which is meant to convey a comic effect, and, to my mind, does so. The masc. termination of the superlative (for which there is no want of parallels) is determined by the character of ἄστυτος as an adj. of two terminations.

Philemon, fr. 65:

ἀργυρίον ἐστὶ· τοῦτ' ἐὰν ἔχῃς, λέγε

πρὸς τὸ τοῦτ' εἰ βούλει, πάντα τοι γενήσεται,

φίλοι, βοηθοί, μάρτυρες, συνοικίαι.

Possibly *πρὸς ὅτινα βούλει*. By *συνοικίαι* is perhaps meant 'profitable investments.'

Fr. 88:

5 καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις πᾶσιν ἡ γῆ θηρίοις
ἐκοῦσα παρέχει τὴν καθ' ἡμέραν τροφήν,
αὐτὴ πορίζουσ', οὐ λαβοῦσα πάννυ μόλις
ὥσπερ τὸ κατὰ χρέος κεφάλαιον ἐκτίνει
τὸ σπέρμα, τοὺς τόκους δ' ἀνευρίσκουσ' αἰεὶ
10 πρόφασιν τιν' αὐχμὸν ἢ πάχνην ἀποστερεῖ.

I cannot see the necessity of supposing with Kock a lacuna after *λαβοῦσα*. The *μὲν* in 5 is answered by *οὐ*, which implicitly conveys the required opposition of mankind. 'All other animals the earth of its own accord provides with daily subsistence, which it furnishes from itself, and does not receive the seed from others and then barely pay it back, like the capital in a sum borrowed, and after all withhold the interest on some pretext it may discover of drought or frost.'

Fr. 91, 3. The various reading of this verse contained in the Latin scholia on the *Aratea* of Germanicus is undoubtedly

οὔτε κακὸν οὔτε γ' ἐσθλὸν, οἷός εἰμ' ἐγώ.

'I whom no one escapes doing, intending or having done any single thing, bad, aye or good, indifferently,—such is my nature.' No doubt *οἷτος* is straightforward, and such a direct announcement would be quite like many similar statements on the first appearance of a stage character; but it is equally possible that the verb had *preceded*, and that the four verses with which the fragm. opens are really the end of a sentence. This was my conclusion many years ago when I read the quotation in Breysig's edition of Germanicus for the first time, and I retain it still on a re-examination.

Fr. 96:

νυνὶ δὲ διαφέροντα τοῖς καθ' ἡμέραν
δαπανήμασιν †δὴ τὸν† βίον ὁρῶ μόνον
λύπας δ' ἔχοντας μείζοντας τοὺς μείζοντας.

Bentley conj. *νῆ τὸν Δία*, *διορῶ*, one of his most infelicitous emendations. It is indeed very bad; is not Kock here guilty of *mala fides*? or can it be that aware of that rare German weakness, hero-worship, he wished to suggest that the god was not *always* divine, but, like other idols, had his weak moments of somnolence? I should prefer *τῶνδε βίον*, 'the life of these,' viz. *τῶν πλουσίων*.

Fr. 109:

ἐὰν μεγίστην ὁ φίλος λέγῃ πόλιν

Probably εὖ λέγῃ or εὐλογῇ.

Fr. 172:

ὅταν τινὰ τάφον στεφανοῖς κόσμῳ ποικίλῃ.

Possibly, where all is doubtful,

ὅταν τάφον στεφανοῖς σὺν κόσμῳ ποικίλῃ.

Fr. 173:

ζῶν γὰρ ἀσκού σταντῶ στεφάνων καὶ μύρα.

Possibly,

σταντῶ παρασχοῦ ζῶν στεφάνων τι καὶ μύρου.

Diphilus, fr. 32, 19-21:

ὁρῶμεν ὀψωνοῦνθ' ἐκάστης ἡμέρας
οὐχὶ μετρίως, βέλτιστέ σ', ἀλλ' ὑπερηφάνως.
οὐκ ἔστιν ἰχθυηρὸν ὑπὸ σοῦ μεταλαβεῖν.

I would suggest ἰχθὺν ξηρὸν, 'it is impossible to purchase in consequence of your monopolizing the market, the merest dry fish that has been left over.' μεταλαβεῖν = to buy after others, *i. e.* what they have rejected.

Fr. 50. The riddle propounded here explains, I think, an obscure conundrum of the Latin Anthology (Riese, 657, 6) *Mollior in tactu*, etc.

Fr. 80:

πρίστις, τραγέλαφος, βατιάκη, λαβρώνιος.
B. ἀνδραποδιον δὴ ταῦθ', ὁρᾶς; A. ἥκιστα γε.
ἐκπωμάτων δ' ὀνόματα.

Surely Dalecamp is right in reading ἀνδραποδίων δὴ, the genitive depending on ὀνόματα, which, however, is taken out of B.'s mouth by A. and introduced after ἐκπωμάτων.

This seems the fitting place for adding some criticisms of passages in Kock's first volume (1860).

Cratinus, fr. 124. γέγραφε should be γέγραπται.

Fr. 250:

μετ' ἐμοῦ διήγες οἶναρον ἔλκων τῆς τρυγός.

μναρόν (fr. 431), which was a word used by Cratinus with the sense of μαλακὸν ἢ δὴ ῥάδιον, seems a probable conj. for οἶναρον.

Fr. 322. I think the metre of this is Archilochian, as in fr. 323, and would write it thus :

ἐστὶ τῶν γὰρ αἰσχροῶν
φίλοισι χαριζόμενον πονηρὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι.

Fr. 334. As Hesych. defines the wine called καπνίας as κεκαπνιασμένος, I suspect that the words in the Schol. on Vesp. 151, τὸν ὑπεκλυόμενον οἶνόν φασί τινες καπνίαν λέγεσθαι, should be τὸν ὑποκαπνιζόμενον.

Fr. 344. ὀλίσκους may be a mistake for τροχίσκους.

Fr. 402. The word διάλαος, which is explained as (1) ἐπιμύλιος δαίμων, (2) a kind of game, ἐν ᾗ διαλέγουσι τὰς ψήφους, (3) ἔσχατος πόρνων, points to two distinct etymologies: (a) from λᾶας, a stone or counter, 'the god between the mill-stones,' i. e. of grinding, 'the game of dividing counters,' and (6) from λαός, 'the people,' 'the traverser of the people,' 'one who goes the round of the mob'; similarly λεωφόρος was applied to a common prostitute, who *glubit magnanimis Remi nepotes*.

Pherecrates, fr. 69 :

τί λάβω †κυρίσοι τὴν κοτυλίσκην; Γ. μηδαμῶς

Kock, very ingeniously, τί λάβω κεράσαι σοι; τὴν κοτυλίσκην; I venture to improve upon this by writing 'γκεράσαι σοι, 'what am I to take for mixing your draught in?'

Plato, fr. 3 :

ὦ Κινύρα, βασιλεῦ Κυπρίων ἀνδρῶν δασυπρώκτων
παῖς σοι κάλλιστος μὲν ἔφυ θυμαστότατός τε
πάντων ἀνθρώπων, δύο δ' αὐτὸν δαίμον' ἔχειτον
ἢ μὲν ἐλαυνομένη λαθρίοις ἐρετμοῖς, ὁ δ' ἐλαύνων.

This is an oracle supposed to be given to the Cyprian king Cinyras about his son Adonis. The two gods are Aphrodite and Dionysus. For ἔχειτον Jacobs conj. ὀλεῖτον. It is easier to suppose the word was ὀχλεῖτον, 'disturb, vex.'

Pherecrates, fr. 92 :

ὥς τοι κακὸν ὄζει TANAMHΔYN ἀλλὰ γλυκύ.

Priscian is here quoting cases of ellipse from Greek and Latin authors. I suspect the word TANAMHΔYN or TANAMEΔYN conceals

a genitive plural, probably of some strong-smelling object. Possibly then ἀμαμηλίδων, a kind of medlar, or μηλεῶν, quinces. On the former view the verse might be

ὥς τοι κακὸν ὧς' ἀμαμηλίδων. B. μᾶλλὰ γλυκύ.

On the second,

ὥς τοι κακὸν ὅζει μηλεῶν. B. μᾶλλὰ γλυκύ.

The μὴ before ἀλλὰ seems necessary—'don't say so; I call it pleasant.'

R. ELLIS.

III.—VOWEL-LENGTH IN OLD ENGLISH.

This paper is intended as a continuation of that published in this Journal, V 318-324, and entitled Vowel-Length in King Alfred's Orosius. The mode of classification is essentially the same as in the latter article, except that the proper nouns, being few in number, are grouped at the end of the first main division. *Swð*, which was inadvertently placed under Original Length in the former article, is here restored to its rightful position. On the other hand, the preterits *bæd*, *cwæð*, *læg*, *sæt*, *spræc*, and *wræc* have been assigned to Original Length on the basis of §391, note 3, of my edition of Sievers' Old English Grammar, and the preterits *bær*, *bræc*, and *tær*, of the Fourth Ablaut Class, have been associated with them. This assignment is merely a tentative one, for the problem offered to the investigator is by no means fully solved. The most probable explanation is that of Sweet (Proceedings of the Philological Society for June 3, 1881), who attributes the long vowel of the singular to the analogy of the plurals. This, if true, would hold as well for the Fourth as the Fifth Ablaut Class. Indeed, it might be thought to apply to *wæs*, plural *wæron*, but I have not ventured to include this under the head of Original Length.

The texts which are here treated in full are Part I of Aelfric's Lives of Saints (LS.) and Goodwin's Life of St. Guthlac (Gu.). The variants of LS. are subjoined to the main list of its long vowels, and followed by the Guthlac. The Bodley MS of LS. (B) is remarkable for its numerous instances of secondary lengthening, and in particular for its prefix *í-* from *ge-*. In LS. (not in Gu.) every *þ* has been read as *ð*, for the sake of convenience.

As bearing upon the palatal pronunciation of *sc* in Old English, it may be noted that *gescedd*, LS. 16⁹⁹, 20¹⁸⁶, has the accent upon the *a*, but against this must be adduced *scēan* 92⁹³, 178¹⁶⁹, and *gescēop* 14⁵⁰, 16⁹⁴, 20¹⁷⁰, 86⁶¹³. *Unasæcgendlic*, LS. 12³³, retains its accent even in an unaccented syllable. LS. furnishes instances of *tō-* (= Germ. *zer-*). *Donné*, LS. 70³³⁷, must be a blunder.

The addition of pp. 289-299 to the text of Orosius enables me to furnish the following supplement to my previous paper :

Nouns: *dóm* 292², *cristendóm* 296³⁰, *hús* 296³⁰, *munuclif* 290⁴, *tún* 292¹.

Adjectives: *góðan* 290⁸.

Pronouns: *nán* 296³⁰, 296³⁴.

Verbs: *bád* 292²⁵, *cóm* 294¹, 294⁹, (ge)*dón* 290³⁰, *fór* 294³, 294³⁰, (for)*lét* 296⁷.

Adverbs: *út* 290¹⁰, 292¹⁸.

Prefixes: *áhæfen* 294⁷, *ápewde* 294³, *áwierged* 294¹¹.

The following corrections of the paper on Orosius are due to the kindness of Professor J. M. Hart.

Under *cristendóm*, for 260²¹ read 262²¹; *genót* should be *gemót*; *Profentsæ* 22³⁰ is Lat. *Provincia*, the *-sæ* depending upon analogy; *médo* 20¹⁰ should be short; to *pás* add 58³¹, and to *nán* 94⁴; *án* 116¹, 120³¹, 152³⁰, 154³⁰ are out of place, and belong under *on*, p. 324; to *pá* add 146³; *tó forætan* should be *tó forlætan*; under *abræcon*, change 170³³ to 170³⁸; the 2d and 3d references under *adræfde* should be expunged; before *é* insert *dor* 246³⁴, and expunge the third reference to *dfor*; to *his* add 32³⁸.

The instances of secondary lengthening in the three texts, including the Orosius, may be tabulated as follows:

Before *r*: *-búrige*, *cárfulnysse*, *-cören*, *fær*, *fór-*, *-fóran*, *géalrice*, *híre*, *-stýred*, *swér* (*swúran*), *wér*.

Before *r* + cons.: *ærneð*, *bærnán*, *béarn*, *cárta*, *fórð-*, *hárd-*, (h)*árfæst-*, *réord-*, *þórn*, *wórd*.

Before *l*: *dwól-*, *scóle*, *-stæled*, (ge)*tél*, *wél* (for *wæl*), *wél*.

Before *l* + cons.: *fýlde*, *méld-*, *nólde*, *scólde*, *spéll*.

Before *m*: *cúmen*, *eóm*, *frám*, *héom*, *hún*, *límen*, *trýmiedon*, *súm*.

Before *m* + cons.: (ge) *lám*.

Before *n*: *án-(ón-)*, *híne*, *mán* (*ménn*), *ón*, *scúnode*, *ún-*, *wán-*.

Before *n* + cons.: *bánd*, *hánd*, *híndon*, (an)*súnd*, *wéndan*, *wínd*, *wínd-* (vb.), *wúnd-* (vb.); *háng-*, *héng*, *láng*, *sáng*, *ðíng*; *stænc*, *pānc-*.

Before spirants:

f (*f* + cons.): *cræft*, *hæfde*, *héofon*, *hræfena*, *lóf*, *lúflice*, *-néfa*, *óf*.

s (*s* + cons.): *bíst*, *hís*, *ís*, *mæssa*, *nés*, *ðæs*, *ðís*, *ðús*, *wæs*.

Before palatals (gutturals):

g (*g* + cons.): *-bógen*, *brógden*, *dæg*, *fæger*, *frægn*, *-hógod*, *hrægl*, *mág-* (vb.), *mæg(e)n*, *séglod-*, *síge*, *slæge*, *-slégen*, *wég*.

c: *ác*, *cwiced-*, *fæc*, *íc*, *olæcung*, *spécan*, (*spræcan*), *-swicen*, *-wacod*, *wráce*, *wréc-*.

h : -séah.

Before *p* : drópa, scíp, úp.

Before *t* : æt, fæt, -gít (vb.), gýt (adv.), hwaæt, lút, ðæt, (bil)wíte, -wítan (plur. pret.).

Before *d* : fæder, glæd-, gód (but confused with the adjective), -hréd, médmýcclan, míd.

When final : gé, hé, hwá, mé, nú, sé, swá, ðé, ðú, wé.

In some of the above words the vowel may be considered final in an open syllable, instead of owing its length to the following consonant, as in *híne*, *fæder*, etc. (Cf. Reimann, *Die Sprache der Mittelkentischen Evangelien*, §2.)

The *gé-* of *gédýdon*, Oros. 142⁸, may possibly be a transitional form between *ge-* and the later *i-* of MS. B (LS.).

Swéne for *swefne*, LS. (C), would seem to indicate assimilation of the *f-* and subsequent lengthening.

All three texts agree in accenting the following words : ár (honor), dæł, dóm, éa, líf, mán, sæ; gód, án; bæd, cóm, dón, fón, gán, hét, lét, sæd-, slóg-, stód, swác, swór-; á, ær, má, ðær, út; á-; gód (sb.); swá, úp; ún-.

Or. and LS. agree in respect to the following : ád, ár (brass), æ, bán, bóc, fýr, géar, hám, hús, ræd, scír, wíf; ús, hí, ðás, nán; fíf; bád, dráf, sóc, wát, wrát; éac, hú, ðá; tó; mán (homo); hé, hís, hím; nú; óf, ón; ón-.

LS. and Gu. concur as regards the following : gást, hád, híw, hláf, lác, lár, mód, rice, spræc, tíd, tíma, wíte; mín, úre; fúl, gelíc, twá; bædon, cwædon, hóf, læt-, -rás, gewít-, gewát; iú; lá; dæg; wæs.

Or. and Gu. coincide in accentuating the following words : dæd, gerád, hæðen, tún; rice (aj.), twá; hánd.

AELFRIC'S LIVES OF SAINTS. PART I.

I.—ORIGINAL LENGTH.

Nouns.

ád 110³²⁰, 216¹¹⁷. æ 12⁴⁰, 230¹⁷⁸, 232²¹⁸. ánrednyss 20¹⁰⁸. áre (property) 70³⁸⁴. áre (brass) 176¹³².

bán 140³⁵⁸, 252²³⁰, 254³⁸¹, 254²⁸⁸, 254²⁸⁹, 254²⁷⁴. béna 56¹¹⁷. blód 60¹⁸², 210⁸, 250¹⁹¹. bóc 4⁴³, 6⁷⁰, 6⁷⁴, 122¹⁰², 156¹³⁸; lárboç 100¹⁸⁹; bec 4³⁸, 6³⁸, 12⁴⁰, 94⁸⁷, 122¹⁰⁴.

cæge 78¹⁸⁴. cwén 68³⁹².

dæġ 16⁹⁷, 58¹²³, 58¹²⁹, 86⁹²⁰, 166³³¹. dæð (for *dleað*) 18¹⁴⁶. dēma 46³⁷⁶. dōm 70³³⁸; dōmsetle 174⁸²; cristendōm 26¹³, 44³³⁰, 104³⁴⁸, 228¹⁴⁵, cristendōme 54⁸²; kynedōm 144⁴⁴⁴; martyrdōm 24⁴, 170⁴; swicdōm 256³⁹²; wysdōm 24³²⁷.

éa 54⁶⁵, 54⁷⁰, 54⁷⁴, 66²⁷⁰, 156¹⁰⁰. écnysse 168³⁵⁹; æcnysse 14⁶⁴.

flán 144⁴²⁷. flór 204¹⁶⁸. fótadle 124¹³⁷; fēt 100¹⁰⁰, 112³⁰², 136³⁰³, 192³⁶⁰; fētt 46³⁵⁴. fȳr 40²⁶⁰, 96¹²⁴, 112³⁵⁶, 112³⁹³.

gást 10¹⁴, 22¹⁸⁸. gear 50¹⁰, 54⁸¹; gær 52²³. angúm 10¹¹.

hád 28⁷⁹; mægðhád 106³⁸¹. hæse 102³¹⁰. hætan 196²⁴. hám 46³⁶⁸, 60¹⁶³, 78⁴⁹², 174⁸², 186³⁷⁹. behát 74⁴⁰⁶. híwes 78⁴⁸⁸; híwe 28⁶², 30⁸⁰, 36¹⁸⁶, 36³⁰². hláf 48⁴⁰⁹; hláfe 78⁴⁷⁸. hús 178¹⁶⁹; hūse 76⁴³⁸, 78⁴⁶⁴. hūsle 58¹³¹. hwile 18¹³². inngehýd 240⁴⁷.

isen 196³⁹.

lác 46³⁷¹, 112³⁸⁸, 142³⁰⁰, 150³², 150⁵⁵, 152⁷⁶, 162³⁸⁶, 190³⁴⁹, 214⁶⁵, 236²⁷⁸, 240¹⁵. láf 144⁴³⁰. lár 26²⁴, 52²⁶, 122¹¹⁰; láre 50¹¹; lárþóc 100¹⁸⁹; lárspell 58¹⁴¹. líc 88⁸⁶⁴, 106²⁶⁹, 114⁴³², 184²⁴⁷, 206¹⁹⁷, 208²¹⁴, 236²⁷⁰, 238²⁸⁸, 252²²⁸; lice 146⁴⁰⁹. lif 14⁶⁹, 18¹⁴², 52⁴⁵, 80⁵⁰⁸, 86⁵⁰⁹, 130²³⁰, 136³²⁰, 138³³⁸, 160³²¹, 168³⁵⁷, 170¹², 200⁸¹, 202¹⁰⁷, 256³⁰⁷; life 34¹⁶¹, 62²⁰³, 106²⁷², 156¹³², 166³³²; munuclíf 154¹¹⁸, 154¹¹⁹, 156¹⁴⁶, munuclife 162³⁸⁹; mynsterlíf 150⁵⁷. lig 110³²⁴. líget 114⁴²².

mædene 30⁸⁸; mædenu 44³²². mán 74⁴⁰²; mándæda 218¹⁴⁵. mód 10⁴, 14⁵⁸, 20¹⁸⁴, 20¹⁸⁵, 26³⁶, 28⁶⁵, 52²⁹, 72³⁰⁰, 176¹¹¹.

ræd 16⁹⁸, 68³⁰², 156¹⁴². ræf 54⁶⁹. ríce 14⁷⁹, 150⁵⁴; cynrríce 40²⁷². gerím cræfte 218¹.

sæ 18¹²⁵, 140³⁷⁴, 210¹, 224⁷⁹, 248¹⁷⁵, 250¹⁸⁴. gesceád 16⁹⁹, 20¹⁸⁸. scȳr 226¹²⁹. snæd 60¹⁶¹. spéda 52⁵¹. sundorspræce 28¹⁸. stán 48³⁹¹, 152⁹³; marmstán 206²⁰¹; weorcstán 48³⁸⁹. stól 220⁷; bisceop-stól 220⁴, 220⁶. stræt 106²⁸⁸, 178¹⁴³. swin 80⁵²⁸.

tid 84⁵⁸⁶; tide 18¹²⁴; nontid 228¹²⁷. tíma 10⁷; tíman 50⁶, 68³⁹². pén 140³⁸², 204¹⁶⁷.

wætan 164²⁷⁷. wáh 206¹⁷². wealhstód 80⁵²⁵. wif 26¹⁶, 36¹⁹⁴, 36²⁰², 46³⁸¹, 60¹⁷⁰, 60¹⁷⁴, 80⁵²⁷, 82⁵⁴⁹, 88⁶⁵⁰, 88⁶⁵⁹, 88⁶⁶², 110³⁴⁸, 118⁴³, 118⁴⁶, 122¹⁰⁰, 234²¹⁹, 236²⁵⁹, 236²⁶⁰, 236²⁷⁵; wífe 60¹⁷², 60¹⁷⁹, 62²⁰⁸, 72²⁸⁶, 82⁵⁵¹, 88⁶⁵⁸, 110³⁶⁵. wíge 62²⁰⁷. wín 164²⁷⁴, 164³⁷⁶, 164³⁸¹. wisdom 12³⁶. wíta 140³⁷⁴. wíte 106²⁶⁷; wýtum 46³⁸². wóp 120⁷. ymbwlátunge 20¹⁸³.

Pronouns.

(1) Personal: ús 14⁷⁸, 16⁹⁸, 28⁷¹, 50⁴²², 58¹⁴⁶, 62²¹⁷, 62²⁸⁰, 64²²¹, 92⁵¹, 130²³¹, 166³⁰⁷, 230¹⁵⁷, 242⁸⁰, 250¹⁸⁸. héo 26³⁸. hí (250 times).

(2) Possessive: mín 34¹⁸⁸, 34¹⁸⁹, 38²²⁵, 48⁴¹⁹, 72²⁷⁶, 108³¹³. ðín 56¹¹⁶, 82³⁴⁸, 130²¹⁸. úre 52⁵¹.

(3) Demonstrative: séo 30¹⁰⁵. ðám 24⁴²⁰, ðán 42³¹⁰; ðí 14⁷⁸, 46³⁸³, 126¹⁶⁴, 146⁴⁸²; ðá (72 times, not distinguishing between pronoun and adverb); ðás 38²²⁰, 46³⁸⁰; ðæra 70³⁵¹.

(4) Indefinite: gehwám 30⁹⁴. nán 4⁴⁶, 12⁴³, 14⁴⁸, 14⁶², 14⁶⁵, 22²⁰⁷, 164²⁷⁴. nátes 28⁷¹.

Adjectives.

(1) Descriptive: ánrædum 20¹⁶⁸. árfæstan 32¹¹⁹. árleasan 22²¹³, 198⁵⁸. árwurðe 74⁴⁰⁰.

éce 12²⁸, 52⁴⁵, 112³⁸⁵, 136³²⁰, 208²²², 256³⁰⁷; écan 160²²².

fúl 224⁹³. fús 62²⁰⁷.

góð 14⁴⁸, 16⁶⁰, 16⁹¹; góða 104²⁸², 198⁵⁹; góðe 256³¹⁴; góðum 30⁹⁹.

hál 128¹⁸⁹, 150³⁸, 186²⁷⁹, 204¹⁴⁰, 210¹⁹, 220³¹, 234²⁴²; unhál 134²⁸⁶, 184²⁶⁵, 210⁵. hálgan 140³⁸². hát 250¹⁹⁷.

læs 162²⁰⁹; þelæs 14⁵⁸. gelíc 12²¹, 156¹⁰⁴, 200⁸¹; gelíce 22²¹⁴; gelícan 34¹⁷⁶. unasæcgendlíc 12²³.

níwan 12⁴⁰, 14⁴⁹.

(2) Numeral: án 10¹⁵, 12¹⁶, 12¹⁸, 12²⁵, 12⁴¹, 16⁹³, 16¹¹⁶ (twice), 16¹¹⁶ (twice), 54⁷³, 60¹⁷², 66²⁶⁹, 78⁴⁶⁸, 80⁴⁹⁹, 88⁶²⁵, 132²⁵¹, 134²⁸⁰, 152⁹², 158¹⁹⁵, 180¹⁷⁵, 200⁷⁶, 208²¹⁸, 226¹⁰⁸, 248¹⁵⁸, 250²⁰², 250²⁰⁷, 250²¹⁰; ána 12³², 14⁷⁷, 18¹⁴⁹; ánre 18¹²⁴; ánum 164²⁷⁵.

fif 22¹⁹⁸, 22²⁰⁰, 50¹⁰, 140²⁷¹; fiftyne 52²².

twá 44²⁴², 46³⁸⁰, 168³⁸¹.

Verbs.

(ge)bæd 48³⁸⁶, 64²²⁷; (a)bædon 70²²⁶. bæð 88⁶⁵¹. (ge)bíde 84⁵⁹⁸; (a-, ge)bád 96¹⁰², 108³⁰⁴. (a)bát 126¹⁷⁴. (tó)bræc 60¹⁸⁸. brúce 34¹⁶¹; bræc (for bréac) 62²¹². (ge)bræd 34¹⁵¹. (a-, ge)búgan 20¹⁰⁷, 46²⁰⁹, 46²⁶⁴; (for)búge 20¹⁵⁴, 24²²⁷.

(ge)ciged 54⁸³, 196¹⁰, 210⁵, 238¹⁰; (ge)ícged (for *geícged*) 194¹; (ge)cýged 44³⁶⁰. (a-, be)cóm 26³⁶, 38²⁴⁴, 40²⁵², 48⁴¹², 96¹²⁴, 114⁴²³, 170³, 180¹⁸¹, 236²⁶⁵; (be)cóman 28⁵⁵, 56⁶⁸. cwæð 110²⁴⁰; cwædon 14⁶², cwæden 22²⁰⁸.

(a-, ge-, un)dón 78¹⁸⁴, 108²²⁹, 114⁴⁰², 176¹¹⁵, 178¹⁴¹, 190³⁸⁹, 238²⁸², 256³¹⁴; (for)dó 200⁸³, 220⁸⁰; (ge)dón (pp.) 12⁴², 36²¹², 182²²⁰, 188²¹⁷, 218¹³². (ofer)dráf 232¹⁹⁷. (ge)dréfan 32¹²³. (for)dwán 166³¹⁵.

(a)flíged 68²⁰⁷. (on-, under)fón 20¹⁷², 62²¹⁴, 150³³, 186²⁷⁸, 234²²⁰. (be-, under)fó 62²¹⁷, 88⁶⁴⁹, 172⁸⁰, 188³⁰⁸. (be)frán 72²⁶⁸, 74⁴¹⁰, 102¹⁹⁷, 198⁸⁰, 200¹⁰², 204¹⁸², 214⁷⁸, 226¹¹⁷.

gán 164³⁰³, 190³⁶⁰, 220³³, 234²⁴⁵.

(ge)hæled 32¹³⁰. (be)hát 104²⁶¹, 188³⁰⁷, 190³⁶³; (be-, ge)hét 26¹¹, 28⁴⁰, 28⁷⁴, 30¹¹³, 36¹⁹¹, 38²¹⁴, 42²⁹⁸, 46³⁶¹, 46³⁶³, 46³⁷⁸, 48³⁸⁹, 48³⁹⁶, 56⁹⁴, 62¹⁹⁰, 62²¹⁴, 64²³⁵, 68²⁹⁷, 68³¹⁰, 72²⁶⁵, 74⁴⁰⁹, 76⁴³⁸, 78⁴⁷⁴, 84⁵⁹⁶, 100¹⁷⁸, 104²³¹, 108³⁰², 108³²⁹, 108³³², 110³⁶⁰, 110³⁶², 110³⁶⁴, 114⁴⁰³, 114⁴⁰⁸, 114⁴²⁰, 116¹⁴, 124¹²¹, 124¹³⁴, 128¹⁶³, 140³⁷¹, 140³⁷⁴, 140³⁷⁶, 140³⁸³, 144⁴²², 144⁴²⁶, 146⁴⁰⁰, 146⁴⁵⁴, 146⁴⁵⁶, 146⁴⁶⁴, 148¹³, 154⁹⁹, 154¹¹², 156¹⁶⁵, 160²⁰⁶, 160³⁰⁹, 160³¹¹, 160³¹⁷, 160³²⁵, 162²³⁷, 162²⁴⁴, 170²³, 172²⁹, 174⁸², 174⁹⁶, 178¹⁴¹, 178¹⁴³, 182²¹⁶, 182²²⁰, 184²⁴⁴, 186²⁸⁹, 190³⁶⁵, 190³⁶⁶, 192³⁷³, 196⁹, 198³⁹, 198⁸⁹, 200⁹², 200⁹³, 202¹¹³, 202¹²⁸, 202¹²⁹, 206¹⁸³, 214⁶⁹, 214⁷⁹, 224⁶⁶, 230¹⁶⁸, 238²⁶⁰, 240²⁸, 244⁹⁸, 252²⁴⁵; behéton 170¹⁸. hlóh 128¹⁹⁹. hnáh 122⁹². hóf 106²⁷⁷. (a)hón 48³⁸⁹.

lácnian 202¹³⁰. læg 68³⁰¹. (for)læt 38²⁴⁰, 102³⁰⁰, 106³⁷², 250¹⁸⁷; (for)lét 70³⁵³, 126¹⁶⁸, 182²¹², 232¹⁹⁸; (for)léte 42²⁶⁸; (be)láf 138³³⁹. (a)léat 190³⁴³.

(be)mænan 108³¹⁸. mót 72³⁹¹, 182²³³.

(ge)néalecan 28⁶². (ge)nám 28⁷⁷.

rād 62²⁰⁸, 162²⁶³. (a)rís 158¹⁷², 220³⁰, 222⁴⁴, 224⁷¹, 224⁸⁸, 226¹¹⁵; (a)rás 52³⁹, 86⁶¹⁴, 106³⁷⁹, 140³⁶⁰, 158¹⁶⁹, 158¹⁷⁴, 160³¹³, 162³⁶⁸, 222⁴⁵, 222⁶³, 230¹⁵⁸, 234²⁴⁹, 254³⁶⁷. ríxode 66³⁸⁹.

(ge)sæd 30¹¹⁰, 42²⁹⁶, 42²⁹⁹. sæp 60¹⁸². sæt 72³⁷². scaét 54⁷³. scéan 92⁶³, 178¹⁵². (ge)scéop 14⁸⁰, 16⁹⁴, 20¹⁷⁰, 86⁶¹³. sénode 76⁴²⁸. slóh 70³⁴⁵. smæda 68³⁹⁸. (for-, wið)sóc 32¹⁴¹, 64²⁴⁷, 74⁴¹⁴, 106²⁹⁸. (a)spáw 32¹³⁸. (ge)spræc 10¹², 26⁴², 160³⁵⁸. (a-, ofer)stigan 12²⁰, 12²³, 64²³⁵; (a)stáh 12²⁵, 52⁴⁰, 144⁴³⁸, 224⁸¹. (æt)stód 56¹¹³, 66²⁶⁸, 80⁵⁰⁰, 114⁴²⁸, 146⁴⁴⁸, 182²²³, 206¹⁷⁶, 208²³¹, 228¹³⁸. (ge)swác 44³³⁶. swór 36²⁰⁹, 66²⁵⁹, 244¹⁰⁹.

(a)ðwóth 124¹⁴⁷.

(a)wácian 116²². wæron 26⁴⁴. wát 12⁴², 18¹³⁶, 20¹⁸⁴, 64²²⁶, 80⁵¹³, 166³²⁷, 188³⁰⁶, 214⁸⁰, 226¹²⁰. wát (error for *wét*, altered from *wæt*) 12¹⁷. gewítan 164²⁹³, 166³³²; gewít 170²⁵, 170³⁷; gewát 32¹¹⁷, 42³⁰⁸, 50⁴²³, 86⁶²², 114⁴³¹, 164²⁷¹, 166³³⁶, 208²³², 218¹²⁸, 218¹⁴⁹, 222⁵⁸, 236²⁶⁸, 248¹⁵⁹. (a)wóc 54⁹², 92²², 186²⁷⁷, 212²³. (a)wraíce 40²⁹⁸. (a)wrát 58¹⁴³, 58¹⁴⁵, 60¹⁷², 72³⁶², 76⁴⁵⁷, 80⁵³², 82⁵³³, 152⁸⁶, 168³⁶¹, 168³⁶⁶, 220¹⁹.

Adverbs.

á 14⁶⁴, 18¹⁴⁸, 24²⁴², 86⁶²⁴, 90⁶⁷⁰, 92⁴⁵, 114⁴³⁴, 146⁴⁷⁴, 154¹⁰⁰, 168³⁵⁶, 172⁵⁰, 194⁴²⁹, 208²³⁶. adúne 72³⁸⁸. æne 18¹⁴¹. ær 4⁴¹, 6⁵⁷, 10¹, 12¹⁷, 14⁶⁹, 14⁶⁹, 16¹¹³, 18¹²⁷, 18¹²⁹, 24²²², 24²²³, 26³⁴, 34¹⁸⁰, 40³⁶⁷, 40³⁷⁴, 48³⁹², 56¹⁰¹, 110³⁴⁹, 124¹²⁹, 142⁴⁰⁰, 162²⁵¹, 164²⁹⁷, 166³¹⁹, 168³⁶¹, 168³⁶⁶, 220¹⁹.

222²⁸, 228¹³⁷, 250²⁰⁰, 252²²⁰, 254²⁵⁷. ærþán 208²⁰⁰. ánmodlice 28⁵⁹, 58¹⁴⁷.

cáflíce 126¹⁵¹.

éáo 152⁶⁴; éácc 156¹⁵¹.

(ðá)gýt 26¹⁴.

hér 80⁵⁰³, 120⁶¹, 150⁵⁰, 156¹³⁵, 166³¹¹, 204¹⁵³. hú 10¹, 24³, 32¹²², 36²¹², 38²¹⁷, 52³⁸, 52³⁹, 74⁴¹¹, 74⁴²³, 76⁴³⁶, 76⁴⁶⁰, 98¹⁵⁹, 116²¹, 126¹⁷⁵, 128¹⁹³, 154¹¹⁰, 158¹⁷⁵, 170³, 250²⁰². (æg-, ge)hwær 18¹³⁹, 220¹³, 254²⁷³. hwí 36²⁰¹.

iú 164²⁷⁶, 172⁴³, 172⁴⁶.

gelíce 14⁷⁴; ungelíce 14⁵⁰. gelóme 32¹⁴⁴, 32¹⁴⁶, 80⁴⁹⁷.

má 14⁵⁸, 110³³⁵, 132²⁴⁹, 132²⁶⁴, 162²⁶⁶, 162²⁸⁹, 170²⁰, 208²²⁰. mærlíce 192²⁷⁹.

ná 14⁷⁰, 14⁷³, 24²⁹⁶.

sóna 62²⁰⁸. swípe 66²⁷³.

tællíce 64²⁴⁹.

ðá (see under Pronouns, Demonstrative). ðá ðá 64²⁴¹. ðá-gýt 26¹⁴. swa ðæh 12⁴⁶. ðær 6⁷⁵, 18¹²², 22²⁰⁴, 38²⁴⁵, 40²⁶³, 40³¹³, 48³⁹⁷, 58¹²⁸, 58¹³⁹, 66²⁵⁹, 66²⁶⁸.

út 32¹³⁸, 60¹⁶⁹, 98¹⁴³, 144⁴²³, 180¹⁹⁵, 216¹³⁷; úteode 58¹³⁹; útteah 164²⁷⁶.

wíslice 162²⁸¹.

Prepositions.

tó 10⁴, 16¹⁰⁸, 26¹⁹, 28⁷⁰, 32¹²⁶, 32¹²⁵, 34¹⁶⁷, 36¹⁸¹, 36¹⁸⁴, 38²³⁵, 38²³⁶, 40²⁵², 40²⁷⁰, 42²⁹⁴, 42³⁰⁴, 44³²⁴, 44³⁴⁴, 46³⁵², 46³⁵⁸, 46³⁷³, 46³⁷⁴, 48⁴¹⁰, 50⁴²², 50⁴, 50¹¹, 50¹⁴, 52⁵², 54⁸², 54⁸⁵, 56⁸⁷, 56⁸⁸, 56⁹⁴, 56¹¹⁰, 58¹²⁸, 58¹⁴⁹, 60¹⁶⁰, 60¹⁶⁶, 62²⁰⁸, 64²²⁴, 68²⁹⁸, 74⁴¹⁰, 80⁵¹⁵, 80⁵¹⁹, 128¹⁹⁴, 142⁴¹¹, 158¹⁷⁰, 180¹⁸⁴, 216¹⁰⁸, 226⁹⁴, (49 times); into 56⁸⁹; tócnéowan 48³⁹².

Interjections.

lá 80⁵¹⁸, 118⁴⁸, 126¹⁶⁹, 146⁴⁴⁹, 198⁴⁸.

Prefixes.

áfyrhte 58¹³⁵; ásend 48⁴¹³.

tóbræc 58¹²²; tóbræcon 64²²⁶; tóscæt 22¹⁵⁷; tótwaeman 28⁷¹; tótwaemde 22¹⁸⁹; tówurpe 66³⁸²; tówurpon 46³⁷⁷.

Proper Nouns.

créta 126¹⁷¹. iób 24²³⁶. lucía 210⁷, 212³³, 212⁴⁶, 212⁵². hierusalém 18¹³². nicéa 68³²⁵. seuéro 40²⁷⁰.

II.—SECONDARY LENGTHENING.

Nouns.

ángin 10¹⁴; ánlícnisse 16⁹⁴; ánlícnyss 46³⁷⁸.
 cárfulnyss 32¹²⁷.
 dæg 36¹⁹⁵, 38²⁴⁶.
 dwólmen 68³¹⁸; gedwólmen 10⁵; gedwólmen 68³¹², 70³⁵⁵;
 gedwólmannum 68³²⁰.
 fæc 42³⁰⁷. fæc 88⁸³⁷.
 gód 10⁵, 16⁹⁵, 24²²⁹, 26²⁷, 52¹⁵.
 lóf 50¹²⁷.
 mán 14⁹⁷, 46³⁰⁰; ealdormán 62¹⁹⁸; gedwólmen 10⁵.
 síge 46³⁷⁹. slæge 64³⁰². godspéll 10⁵. stænc 22¹⁹⁸. swér 80⁵⁰³;
 swúran 48³⁹⁰.
 getél 162²⁶⁸.
 hæmedðing 62³⁰⁴.
 wæl (cf. Adverbs). wér 68²⁹².

Pronouns.

- (1) Personal: ic 22¹⁹²; mé 38²³⁶, 64²²⁷, 64²⁴⁵, 82⁵³⁷, 180¹⁹⁸; wé
 12²⁸, 14⁷⁰, 16⁸⁴, 22²¹⁴, 26¹⁸, 28⁶⁹, 34¹⁷⁷, 62²¹⁰, 70³³⁴, 98¹⁵⁰, 150³⁵, 164²⁹⁷,
 198⁴⁸. ðú 34¹⁶¹, 48⁴⁰⁷, 48⁴¹¹, 60¹⁸⁴, 62¹⁸⁸, 62²³⁰, 72³⁷⁹, 72³⁸⁹, 74⁴¹²,
 76⁴²⁷, 80⁵¹⁵, 82⁵²⁷, 82⁵⁴³, 82⁵⁵⁹, 150³⁸; ðé 62²¹⁹, 66²⁸⁵, 202¹²⁵. gé 30⁸⁷,
 72²⁷⁷, 126¹⁷², 128¹⁹⁷, 180¹⁹⁸. hé (105 times); hís 12⁴⁶, 14⁶⁰, 14⁷⁸, 50⁴²⁸.
 hím 28⁷⁶, 40²⁵⁴, 56⁹⁵, 56¹⁰⁶, 56¹⁰⁷, 56¹¹⁰, 58¹²⁸.
 (2) Demonstrative: sé 14⁷⁷, 46³⁵¹, 48³⁹¹, 56¹⁰⁰, 78⁴⁹⁰, 82⁵⁴⁰, 140³⁷¹,
 162²⁶⁵; ðæt 10⁶; ðæs 28⁷²; ðis 38³¹⁸, 64²²⁹.
 (3) Relative: ðe 88⁶⁴⁵.
 (4) Interrogative: hwá 22²¹⁸; hwæt 22¹⁸⁷.
 (5) Indefinite: sum 10⁷ (cf. also the Latin verb sum 10¹⁰).

Verbs.

únband 122¹¹⁶. bíst 48⁴¹¹. gebógenan 30⁸⁸.
 (for)git 12⁴³.
 (úpa)hæng 58¹²⁷. (a)hréd 208²³³.
 is (83 times, mostly, *i. e.* 69 times, within the first 24 pages);
 ys 22²¹².
 (a)méldod 28⁵³.
 nés 14⁸⁹.
 (ge)séah 56¹⁰¹.

wæs 14⁸⁹, 28⁷⁸, 32¹²⁰, 42²⁹⁶, 42²⁹⁹, 44²²⁸, 44³⁷⁰, 54⁸⁸, 56⁸⁷, 56¹¹⁸, 66²⁶³, 70³³⁴.

Adverbs.

gýt 26¹⁴.

nú 12⁴², 18¹⁴⁰, 24²³⁴, 50⁴²², 52⁵¹, 72³⁷⁹, 80⁵¹⁴, 90⁸⁷⁰, 120⁶⁷, 120⁷⁸, 138³³³, 152⁸⁴, 166³⁰⁸, 172⁴⁰, 176¹¹⁷, 182²³⁵, 206¹⁹², 212⁴², 250¹⁹².

swá (102 times). swá swá 50¹³, 51²¹, 54⁸⁴, 56¹⁰¹, 58¹⁴⁴, 66²⁸⁸, 80⁵⁰⁷, 82⁵⁵⁶, 150⁵², 152⁸².

ðonné 70³²⁷. ðús 24²²⁷.

úp 40²⁶⁴, 64²⁸⁸, 80⁵⁰⁰, 144⁴³⁸; úpp 14⁵⁸, 48³⁹⁴, 54⁷⁵, 94⁸⁶, 94⁷⁴, 162²⁵⁸, 208²¹²; úprihte 14⁸⁷; úpahéng 58¹²⁷.

wélreowlice 46³⁶². wél 6⁷⁵, 44³¹⁷, 60¹⁷⁶, 76⁴³⁵, 78⁴⁸⁰, 158¹⁷³; wæl 40²⁷³; wéldædum 254²⁸⁰; wélwillende 20¹⁷²; wélwillendan 168³⁶⁸; wélwyllendan 206²⁹⁴.

Prepositions.

frám 164²⁹².

óf 22¹⁹⁶, 26³⁴. ón 12²², 14⁸⁴, 18¹³⁷, 20¹⁷⁹, 22¹⁹¹, 22²¹⁷, 22²¹⁸, 26²⁰, 26²³, 28⁵³, 28⁸⁴, 28⁷², 30⁸⁵, 30⁹⁸, 30¹⁰⁶, 32¹³³, 34¹⁵⁶, 38²⁴⁵, 40²⁷⁸, 42²⁸¹, 44³²², 44²²⁵, 48²⁹⁷, 56⁸⁷, 56¹⁰¹, 58¹²⁸, 72³⁶⁹.

Conjunctions.

ác 10⁷, 10¹⁵, 12³⁰, 12³⁶, 14⁴⁸, 14⁸⁷, 14⁸², 14⁷⁶, 16¹¹⁶, 18¹³⁶, 18¹⁴¹, 22¹⁸⁹, 22¹⁹⁹, 22²¹⁵, 24²²⁹, 30⁸⁷, 32¹²⁴, 32¹⁴¹, 32¹⁴⁸, 36¹⁸⁸, 42³⁰², 42³⁰³, 42³⁰⁶, 44³²⁹, 46³⁵², 46³⁷⁴, 46³⁸¹, 48⁴⁰³, 52⁴⁴, 58¹⁵⁰, 62²⁰⁴, 66²⁵⁷, 68²⁹¹, 68²⁹⁵, 70³⁵³, 72³⁶³, 74⁴¹⁴, 92⁴⁵, 114⁴⁰⁶, 128²⁰⁴, 170¹⁹, 180¹⁹⁷, 184²⁵⁶, 234²²⁷.

Prefixes.

ónbryrd 26⁴¹; ónbyrgede 58¹²²; óndret 12⁴⁴; ónlocie 22²¹⁸; ónscunigendlic 44³³⁰.

únasmeagendlic 82²⁴⁸; únasmeagendlicra 172³¹; únbánd 122¹¹⁶; únbegunnen 12¹⁶. úncuð(e) 18¹³⁸, 30⁹⁴; ungeændod 12¹⁶; ungefullod 50³; ungelyfeda 68³¹⁸; unge worht 14⁸⁹; únlichomlic 20¹⁷⁶; únrihtwisnyse 34¹⁶⁰; únschildigan 36¹⁹⁸.

VARIANTS.—ORIGINAL LENGTH.

Nouns: úpflore 222 (B), góódnysse 236 (U), lucía 146 (C), réfa 142 (C), róme 220 (B), rómware 144 (C), sárnyse 118 (C), scýre 140 (C), spræce 134 (C), spræcum 130 (C. V), swærnyssum (C), wif 40 (C, error for *fif*), witu 118 (C).

Adjectives: árwyrdast 128 (C), hál 134 (C), nighwurfedan 124 (C), geswæslicum 136 (C), widgyllum 120 (C. V), wísra 134 (C).

Pronouns: héo 220 (B).

Verbs: (i)æwod 234 (B), beón 228 (B), béon 234 (B), béo 224 (B), (a)bíde 230 (B), (ge)bígean 140 (C), bégde 224 (B), cóm 224 (B), (ge)hælan 128 (C), (ge)hælde 128 (C), (ge)hýnede 132 (C), læd 228 (B), (ge)lýfdon 124 (C), pinigan 140 (C), (fore)sæde 124 (C), sécest 130 (C), sét 220 (B twice), stóðæn 220 (B), writ 72 (O), (æt)ýwde 122 (C).

Adverbs: á 238 (B), áá 46 (C), ær 222 (B), ná 224 (B).

Prepositions: betwéonan 142 (C), tó 224 (B).

Prefixes: áhéng 220 (B).

SECONDARY LENGTHENING.

Nouns: bendum 118 (C), fætt 224 (B), héofenum 224 (B), límen 234 (B), swéne 146 (C), wordum 136 (C).

Adjectives: lút 230 (B).

Pronouns: ðú 224 (B), híne 222 (B), híre 222 (B), héom 220 (B), 226 (B).

Verbs: (for)bærnan 130 (C), (a)brógden 226 (B), (on)búrige 224 (B), cúmen 220 (B), cwicede 224 (B), eóm 228 (B), (á)héng 220 (B), máge 224 (B), réordiaen 224 (B), scólde 140 (C), scólden 136 (C), spécæn 222 (B), spræcen 226 (B), páncigende 132 (C), (a)wéndan 118 (C), (for)wúndon 144 (C).

Adverbs: awég 138 (C), hárdlice 226 (B), hindon 144 (C), nú 230 (B), 234 (B), swá 234 (B), úp 226n, úp(flore) 224 (B), (úp)flóre 222 (B).

Prefixes: íæwod 234 (B), ícwæden 220 (B), 236 (B), íhátæn 222 (B), ílyfe 236 (B), íswytelode 230 (B).

LIFE OF ST. GUTHLAC.

I.—ORIGINAL LENGTH.

Nouns.

æfen 86¹; ánwylynysse 2¹⁵; áre 58¹⁷; árfæstnys 92²¹.

béne 76²⁴.

dæda 12²⁷; dædum 82¹¹, 92¹⁷. dæll 14¹⁰; norðdæll 36²⁸. -dóm 18⁹, 72¹², 92¹⁹. Hrypadún 16³⁰.

eá 20²¹; éaripás 20⁸.

fóre 68; forðfóre 84²⁵, 90¹⁹, 90¹⁸; fórðfóre 94³.
 gást 86²⁷. gerád 22², 72². geryno 86⁶. grétinge 74²³.
 campháde 24²³. hælo 96¹⁰, híw 48³. hláfe 34⁶. hwile 36¹⁵, 84⁹.
 lác 82¹⁴. læfe 62¹⁴. lāre 34⁴, 44²⁵, 46¹¹, 64¹⁷, 82¹⁰; lāra 34¹²;
 lārum 44¹². lifes 30¹⁴. līnenes 26¹³.
 má 32¹². mán 64⁶; móde 28¹⁷, 92²¹, 92²⁵, 94¹⁰.
 næddrena 48³.
 ríce 54⁴, 76²⁵, 78⁴, 78⁶, 78¹², 88², 96⁶; rices 78²³, 80². róde 8¹⁷,
 8²², 48⁸.
 sæ 4¹⁰; norðsæ 20⁸. sæl 34¹³, 78²³. sár 68²⁴; sáres 68²⁷. slæpe
 14¹, 28²⁰, 42¹⁴, 42¹⁸, 94²¹. smíc 44⁴. spræce 72⁵, 72¹¹. stówe 26¹,
 74²², 76¹, 96¹⁸. stræll 28¹⁴, 68²¹; stræle 42²⁵; strælum 24¹⁰. swét-
 nysse 88¹⁶.
 tán 36¹. tíð 22¹², 22²⁷, 68²³, 68²⁵, 86²⁷; tíde 26¹⁸, 74¹¹, 76¹², 82¹⁰,
 84¹, 84²⁶; tída 40²⁵. tíma 8¹². tópum 56¹⁷, 56¹⁰. túnas 14⁶.
 pruh 84⁷. pwéale 10¹⁸.
 wæpna 30²¹. widgilnysse 20¹⁶. wisan 84²⁴. witu 38¹⁷, 38²⁴,
 42²⁴; wita 38⁸, 38¹¹; wítum 38¹².

Pronouns.

- (1) Possessive: mín 38²⁴, 80¹⁹, 82²⁷, 84¹⁶, 86¹⁰, 86¹¹, 94¹¹; mínes
 86⁷; mínre 86⁹; míne 94¹¹; minum 94¹². ívra 30²¹.
 (2) Demonstrative: þære 6¹⁴, 26¹, 56¹⁶, 74²⁴, 96²⁰.
 (3) Indefinite: ælce 32¹⁷. nænig 54²⁴, 82⁷, 96¹⁰; nænigum
 86¹, 86¹¹.

Adjectives.

- (1) Descriptive: ánræð 30⁷. árleasra 38¹; árwyrþne 92⁹.
 blóðigum 48¹.
 clæne 12²¹, 18⁸.
 déorwyrþan 82¹⁴.
 fúle 20⁸, 34²³; fúlice 34²¹.
 gál 74⁶. gelice 34²⁴, 56²¹, 82¹¹. gód 74⁸; góde 56²; góðan 18¹⁵;
 góðum 82¹¹.
 hæpenum 76².
 línenum 84¹⁰.
 mære 6¹⁰, 10¹⁶; mæran 32⁴. unmaete 38¹; unmaëttran 28¹².
 mánfullan 14²¹, 46⁸. mǫran 28¹¹, 36¹⁷.
 ríca 78¹². rúmne 6².
 widgillan 20¹⁰.
 (2) Numerical: án 46¹⁶; ánræð 30⁷, ánræde 96¹. twá 18¹⁸.

Verbs.

ágan 44¹⁸.

bæd 72²⁰; (a)bæde 4²⁰; bædon 8²⁰, 16², 62⁸, 62¹⁴, 66². bæron 40¹⁷. béotodon 38²¹. (a)bídan 36¹⁸. (on)bítan 16²⁴. (a-, on)bræd 42¹⁴, 94²².

cóm 96²; (be)cóme 16²⁰, 68¹⁸; cwæde 74⁴; cwædon 30¹⁷, 38¹⁸, 42¹, 70¹⁸.

(to)dæleð 84¹⁸. dón 84¹²; gedón (pp.) 10²¹, 90²⁸. (on)drædan 96¹.

éode 88¹⁹.

fēran 18²⁷; fēre 84³, 86²⁰. fón 72²⁰ (ofer-, ymb)gán (pp.) 96⁸, 96¹⁴. (on)géaton 16²⁰.

(ge)hádigan 72¹⁹. (ge)hæled 66¹⁹. (ge)hét 86²⁷. (a)hóf 82²⁷, 88⁸.

(a-, ge)lædan 50²⁴, 78²²; lædde 78²⁰; (ge)læddon 36¹¹, 38²; (ge)læded 24²³, 80⁸, 80²⁴. (ge)lærde 44¹⁸, 72¹⁰, 72¹³; (ge)læred 70⁸. (for)lætan 84¹⁸; læte 84²⁸; léton 36¹⁴; (for)læten 54¹⁰.

(ge)náme 44¹¹.

ræde 72¹¹. (ge)ræhte 54²³. (a)rás 16³, 74⁸.

(fore)sæde 20¹⁸, 50²⁰, 62²¹, 72²⁸, 76⁸, 76¹¹, 78¹², 88²¹, 96⁸; sædon 6⁸, 56⁴, 58²⁸, 70¹⁸ (twice); pp. foresæda 50⁴, gesæde 70⁸. sæton 52³, 52¹⁸, 72²⁸. (ge)séon 84³; (ge)sáwon 84⁸. (ofa)slógon 32⁸. spræc 94¹⁸, (ge)spræcon 70¹⁷, 70²⁰, 96²¹. (wið)stód 28¹⁰. (be)swác 76¹⁸. swóron 64⁴.

tæle 4¹, 4¹⁸. tær 56²¹.

(a)pwéan 32⁸.

(a)wácode 66¹⁸. (ge)wæpnode 48⁷. wære 4²⁵, 10²⁰, 26⁸, 30⁷, 36²⁷, 58¹⁸, 62⁷, 64⁵, 66¹⁸, 68¹⁸, 72²³, 72²⁷, 74³, 86³, 90²¹, 94¹²; nære 50²⁰, 76²; wæron 6⁸, 6⁸, 8¹¹, 12²⁸, 16⁷, 18⁸, 34¹⁰, 34¹⁹, 34²⁴, 34²⁸, 40¹³, 42²², 44²⁸, 50²⁷, 52²⁰, 58²⁰, 62¹⁸, 66⁸, 70⁸, 90²⁶, 90²⁸⁽²⁾, 92¹, 94²⁰, 96¹². wíte (censure) 2¹³, 4¹. (ge)wítan 14²⁴; (ge)wát 48¹⁸, 60¹⁸. (on)wíte 4²² (pret. opt.?), 4²¹, 6¹.

Adverbs.

á 18⁴, 24¹¹, 32²⁸, 78¹³, 92²⁴, 92²⁵, 92²⁷, 98⁸ (error); áá 98⁸. ær (23 times, including prepositional uses); ærram 28¹⁰.

færinga 36²⁸; færlíce 10¹.

hás 36¹.

iú 14²⁰, 26⁷.

læs 46¹⁸.

næfre 22⁴, 82¹⁶, 84¹⁹, 84²¹, 92²⁰. néar 52²².
ormædum 88¹⁷.
þær 18²⁷, 32⁵, 40³, 90²⁵.
út 42¹⁵, 56¹. útan 46², 66¹⁴, 86²¹, 96⁶.
wíde 6¹⁰, 14⁶, 26²⁴, 76¹⁴.

Interjections.

lá 4⁶.
wá 38²².

Prefixes.

áhengon 42²²; ofánumene 78¹²; áþolode 38⁹; áwunode 60¹, 86²².

Miscellaneous.

ambrósie 90³. múnus 10²⁴ (Lat.). sé 12⁴ (Lat.). Tátwine 20¹⁷.

II.—SECONDARY LENGTHENING.

Nouns.

ánsyne 84⁶.
béarn 86²⁶.
cártan 50¹⁸. cræft 70¹⁹; cræfte 30²¹.
dáege 26¹⁶, 28¹⁷, 32¹⁷, 88²⁸; gyrtamdáege 74⁴. drópan 98³.
féder 80¹⁹, 84²⁷, 94¹¹. fægernysse 40⁷.
glædnysse 92²⁷. gódes 72⁶ (but perhaps adjective). hánd 8²².
héofonum 84⁶. hræfena 48⁴. hrægl 90²³; hrægle 68¹⁹, 84¹⁹, 84¹⁴.
mægen 26²⁵; mægne 92¹³. mæssan 82¹⁴.
olæcunge 12¹⁷.
scóle 12¹⁷.
þórn 68², 68²¹.
wráce 42¹⁹.

Adjectives.

ansúndne 90²⁰.
bilwíte 12²².
hárfæstlice (MS árfæstlice) 74¹¹.
médmýcclan 34⁵.

Verbs.

(on)bærndest 38¹⁸.
(ge)córen 92¹⁶.
frægn 80¹⁹.

hæfde 28¹³; hæfdon 34²⁰. forhógode 34⁹.
 (ge)lámþ 34¹³, 78¹⁸, 80¹⁸.
 nólde 84⁹.
 sámg 82¹⁴. scúnode 76¹⁰. (ge)slégen(e) 88¹⁰, 92¹. (ge)stýred
 94⁹. (be)swícen 46¹³.
 wás 28⁹. (be)winde 84⁹, 84¹⁴. (ge)wíton (3d plur. pret.) 16¹.

Adverbs.

fórð- 94⁹.
 géarlice 98⁹.
 lúflice 74²⁰.
 swá (53 times).
 úþ- 52⁹.

Prepositions.

æt 62¹⁴.
 befóran 84⁹.
 míð 86¹⁸.

Prefixes.

úneþnys 82⁷; únforgitende 76²⁰; úngeendodan 88¹; úngelic 88¹³,
 úngeliclice 12¹⁷; úngeornfulne 92²⁰; úngewunelican 94²⁴; úngy-
 rede 68¹⁶; únmanige 34¹³; únrotan 94¹⁰, únrotes 80¹⁴, geúnrotsod
 82⁹.

ALBERT S. COOK.

IV.—ON THE SO-CALLED GENITIVE ABSOLUTE AND ITS USE ESPECIALLY IN THE ATTIC ORATORS.

In the general active study of Indo-European grammar during this century the cases have not failed to receive due attention, and much has been brought forward that has been of value. The comparative study of both form and use in the several members of the family could not but be fruitful in good results, and of great aid in the proper understanding of this important section of grammar. Of theories concerning the cases we have in the main two: the localistic, and the anti-localistic. According to the former the genitive is the case whence, the dative the case where, and the accusative the case whither. Nothing could seem more natural, and so, although there were points in which this theory halted, especially the genitive in Latin, it found supporters from very early times. In the present century its most important champions were Hartung, Wüllner, Michelsen, and R. Kühner in the first edition of his 'Ausführliche Grammatik,' and it met with but little active opposition until in 1844 Th. Rumpel wrote his excellent work, 'Die Casuslehre' (Halle, 1844), viewing the subject from the standpoint of Greek and Latin alone. In a very able manner some of the wrong tendencies in the study of language are here set forth, *e. g.* the application of logical categories to language, and the determination of grammatical relations by the material signification of words, or by a translation, be it into Latin, German, or any other language. The localistic theory is overthrown as an outgrowth of such evil tendencies; and that his arguments were convincing we see quite plainly from the fact that Kühner, in the second edition of his grammar, retracted what he had said and accepted Rumpel's views.

The genitive is defined by the latter (p. 196), 'Der Genitiv ist der Casus der auf sein Besonderes bezogenen Allgemeinheit, der ein Substantiv als sein Besonderes bestimmenden Allgemeinheit.' While there was much that is true in what Rumpel said, it was left for comparative philology, with the aid of the Asiatic languages of the family, to determine and show the true nature of that local

element in the cases. The work had been begun by Bopp before Rumpel's treatise appeared; the latter, however, based all his conclusions on the internal study of the Greek and Latin languages themselves. Since Rumpel's time the genitive has been shown, especially by Delbrück, to be in Greek a mixed case which resulted from the fusion of two original cases, the genitive and the ablative. It was the presence of this ablative element which led to the assumption that it is the 'whence' case. The pure genitive could not have been used with prepositions; that the Greek genitive is so used is due to the same ablative element. The genitive, then, is an adnominal case (as Rumpel had it); and when as such it is used with verbs, it depends on the noun idea in the verb; or it is an abl. (local) case used with prepositions, verbs of separation, etc. This side Rumpel did not recognize. So much must stand. It is at times, however, difficult to decide to which of the two we must refer certain uses, and the attempts to explain either the origin of the I. E. genitive, or the real meaning of the ending, have generally resulted in hypotheses of greater or less value, but only as hypotheses.

Of the many interesting uses of this case in Greek, both as pure genitive and as ablative, the following paper will be restricted to that use according to which a noun in the genitive, with a participle agreeing with it, may stand in a sentence of which it is ordinarily not the subject or object, in what may be termed an absolute way, that is to say without any case dependence on any other word, practically (though not really) the equivalent of a subordinate clause, and expressing whatever relations the participle is capable of expressing: time, cause, concession, condition. Strictly speaking the construction is only absolute in so far as the noun in the gen. does not depend on any other word in the sentence, the whole expression being as little absolute or independent as a subordinate clause would be. The term absolute has, however, become sanctioned by use, and will be accepted here; it furnishes a convenient name for the construction, and there is really no more harm done in keeping the word, provided we remember its true meaning, than there is in the retention of the names of some of the cases themselves. The phenomenon, broadly speaking, is not at all peculiar to Greek, we have it in most I. E. languages, but other cases are employed, accusative, dative, ablative and locative being so used. A somewhat similar use we find in Hebrew. There is thus an evident desire for a case expression of such relations, when they are simple, without having recourse to a subordinate clause.

The origin of this use of the case in Greek is one of those things that can only be settled by conjecture. Some see in it the Skt. locative appearing in Greek, and regard it as a proof of the existence of such a locative element in the Greek genitive. It is far more probable that it originated on Greek soil and was there developed. In the earliest Greek poetry we find but few examples, and these would seem to point to such an origin. That the dependent pure genitive is not the one to which we must refer this use is made likely by the following fact: being an adnominal case, it was always felt as accompanying and depending upon another noun; this relation was distinctly felt, and it is far less probable that uncertainty as to the exact construction of such a genitive gradually gave rise to the absolute use than that this is due to some use not dependent on any noun in the sentence. To me, after inclining for some time to the ablative side, the most plausible view seems that which is advocated by Holzweissig in his *Syntax*, and which refers it to the use of the genitive in expressions of time,¹ as in *νυκτός*, a use which dates far back in I. E. languages, being found in Vedic Skt. as well as in the earliest Greek. By the use of a participle with such a gen., and the gradual emphasis of the participial element, the construction could have been easily and naturally born. A number of the examples in Homer involve expressions of time, as *ἔρεος* and *ἐνιαυτοῦ*.

Classen, in his 'Beobachtungen über den Homerischen Sprach-

¹ Brugmann says in his recently published *Griechische Grammatik* (s. 105): 'Der "gen. absol." ist auf griechischem Boden in ganz ähnlicher Weise entstanden wie der acc. cum inf. Der Gen. gehörte von Haus als echter oder als ablativischer Gen. zum regierenden Verb (Vgl. z. B. Θ 118, 477, M 392), schied dann aus dem Verband mit diesem aus und wurde als Subjekt zum Part. gefühlt. Die Konstruktion des gen. absol. war fertig, sobald sie sich zu solchen Verba gesellte, von denen ein Gen. oder Abl. nicht abhängen konnte (Vgl. z. B. A 88). Vor dieselbe trat dann auch ὥς, ähnlich wie ὥστε vor den acc. c. inf.' In my essay on the *Syntax of Pindar* (p. cxii) I have said, 'The detachment must have been gradual, beginning probably with the gen. of the time within which with the present and extending to the aorist, beginning with the pure genitive and extending to the abl. genitive until it became phraseological and lost to consciousness. The last step is taken when the subject is omitted.' For many years I have taught that we are to start from the genitive of time within which, but as it is impossible to escape the time after which, it seems better to bring in the ablative element as a consequence of that differentiation of present participle and aorist participle, which resulted in giving the latter the notion of priority, which does not inhere in it. The notion of priority given, the abl. element of the genitive would assert itself.—B. L. G.

gebrauch,' has treated this subject at some length, and as he is the only one who has attempted to give a full account of its origin, others generally referring to him, and especially as the work he attempts is, on the whole, very thoroughly done, it will be of interest to discuss his theory at length. In his treatment of the participle, Classen deplores the almost utter absence of the German participle, except as an attributive; an absence which causes German translations to lose in force and beauty, and often makes conceptions inadequate or even utterly wrong. The English language has fared better in this respect, and every English-speaking person acquainted with the German language will agree with him. Any treatment of the gen. abs., he rightly urges, must have in view the nature of the participle and the relations it expresses. The germs of the use he finds in those cases in which the relation of a participle in the genitive agreeing with a noun is not clear because it is found at some distance from it, or in which the noun is not expressed at all. He gives examples: first like α 140, *χαριζομένη παρεόντων* (*i. e.* giving freely of the things at hand), and finds fault with Ameis for telling the truth in saying that it is a partitive genitive. Again, with prepositions: Θ 476, *στείνει ἐν αἰνοτάτῳ, περὶ Πατρόκλοιο θανόντος*, especially with *ὑπό*, where the later language would have omitted the prep.: Π 277, *ἀμφὶ δὲ νῆες | σμερδαλέον κονάβησαν ἀυσάντων ὑπ' Ἀχαιῶν*. (But is the conception the same?) Still clearer, he says, are the cases where, by poetical license, a preposition is separated from its noun by a verb, *e. g.* B 95-6, *ὑπὸ δὲ στεναχίζετο γαῖα | λαῶν ἰζόντων . . .* and the top of this ladder of doubt is reached in cases like E 665 sqq., *τὸ μὲν οὐ τις ἐπεφράσατ' οὐδ' ἐνόησεν | ἡμεροῦ ἐξέρύσαι δόρυ μείλιον ὄφρ' ἐπιβαίῃ | σπενδόντων*. Although, says he, grammar would unhesitatingly refer such genitives to the partitive use, he is convinced that they are absolute, and that such a participle in the course of time was not felt as agreeing with the noun (expressed or understood), since the tie connecting the two, as may be seen from the examples he gives, is one varying in strength and intimacy, and may become so loose as to make it come to be felt as absolute.

Throughout this discussion Classen makes several serious mistakes: first, in supposing that the ordinary Greek of Homer's time and earlier spoke just as the poet wrote, or if he would attribute the construction to the influence of such poems on the language of the people, in supposing that the Greeks in reading or listening were so careless as to forget the exact dependence of

words not contiguous ; in the second place, in keeping out of mind what he himself had taken the trouble to explain : that the Greek participle and the German participle are far removed from being alike in use. So he says that in I 462, *ἐνθ' ἐμοὶ οὐκέτι πάμπαν ἐρητύει' ἐν φρεσὶ θυμὸς | πατρὸς χωρόμενοιο κατὰ μέγαρά στρωφᾶσθαι*, taken strictly according to the laws of grammar *πατρὸς χωρόμενοιο* belongs to *μέγαρά*, but nobody will consider a German genitive the true rendering. Certainly not, but the trouble lies not so much in the German genitive as in the German participle ; it is not 'through the halls of my (angry or) angered father,' as Classen seems to think it must mean if not absolute, but 'of my father angered as he was,' or 'because he was angered.' On I 595 he says (p. 170) that although we recognize the dependence of the genitive on a noun, we must notice that the expression gives the point of time, and in other cases it may in like manner express cause, condition, etc. Of course we notice this ; it lies in the nature of the Greek participle without its being in the absolute construction. But the fact that at a later period the absolute genitive brought out these relations more prominently seems to have misled Cl. into the belief that in it alone the participle can express them. With him I believe that the construction is a growth on Greek soil, but hardly that it originated as he says. Let us see. In the history of its use we trace a gradual growth. Cl. himself has shown that it does not occur frequently in Homer ; we shall see later that it increases in frequency, reaching its maximum in Attic prose. We must therefore be very chary of accounting for a genitive as absolute in the early language, inasmuch as it was not so familiar a use as to give the key-note to the explanation of constructions that may be different. But these Cl. says are the original abs. uses. To my mind this seems quite improbable, for several reasons. Had the construction originated so, the use of a participle in the gen. without a noun would have been the original use, as Cl. himself admits (p. 173), for all the examples he gives with noun expressed are clearly dependent. Now of all the examples of real gen. abs. in Homer but few belong to that category. As we are, however, left to suppose that in Homer the construction is still nascent, or at least in its infancy, we should expect a few more examples of the original use. The participle without a subject in the gen. abs., though not unfamiliar, is not frequently used at any period of the language, and always where there is a reason for the omission, that is, when the subject is general, has been referred to or is

implied in the participle; here at times the participle in another case might have been used without subject expressed. Classen's explanation would have us believe that the people on finding such (according to him) unaccountable genitive participles, assigned them to general subjects, felt them as absolute, and then extended the use by adding nouns to participles thus felt as absolute. But why should the Greek have chosen to forget the exact connection of a participle in the genitive away from its noun and not have done the same with any other case? Classen felt this and tried to show that the language was extending these efforts to conceive participles as absolute in all directions; first he adduces partitive apposition, as for instance K 224, *σύν τε δὴ ἔρχομένῳ καὶ τε πρὸ δ τοῦ ἐνόησεν*, where *ἔρχομένῳ* 'is felt as an absolute use'; again (p. 159), cases like K 187, *ὡς τῶν νῆδυμος ὕπνος ἀπὸ βλεφάρουιν ὀλώλει | νύκτα φυλασσομένοισι κακῇν*, where the dative, he says, is used after the analogy of a 423, *τοῖσι δὲ τερπομένοισι μέλας ἐπὶ ἑσπερος ἦλθεν*, from such examples, he adds, we only conclude that the Homeric language was on the road to use the dative as an absolute case beside the genitive, but the latter won the victory because of the manifold relations it expresses. Because the author chose to change his point of view, and so the case, without writing out the change that has gone on in his mind, must the altered case be absolute? If the dative in K 187 be taken absolutely, what would it mean? Certainly not: 'When other men, or men in general, were on guard.' No one could have failed to know the connection; a Greek at least would have followed the change in construction without thinking that the second case had no reason for its existence according to ordinary rules, and was therefore absolute. And after all, as has been said above, the language of Homer was not a spoken language, nor indeed did the people of any period speak as they wrote poetry, and such uses as those to which Cl. attributes the origin of the gen. abs. were unknown among the people. Did Homer go through the process of forgetting himself, or if there was no Homer, the poets who go by his name? No, we can readily see that the gen. abs. as it appears in Homer is a construction used by the people, and probably in its earliest stages. We cannot, therefore, accept Classen's views without assuming facts and changes that are impossible. Others, as Hübschmann, and Holzweissig in his treatise 'Wahrheit und Irrthum der localistischen Casustheorie,' p. 81, regard the construction as originating, in part at least, from the abl. element. But this, plausible at first sight, presents greater

difficulties. Accounting for the construction as we have done makes its origin and subsequent growth both easy and natural, as all language changes necessarily are.

When we first meet the gen. abs. in Homer it is apparently yet in its early stages. If it originated in the use of the gen. to express time it had lost all feeling for its origin, and was used with other words than those expressing that relation; its use is, however, largely restricted to that participle which was the one used originally, *i. e.* the present, as in *νυκτὸς οὔσης*. It is only later that the use of the aorist is fully developed. In Homer too the relation expressed is generally that of time; cause, concession and condition are developed gradually. There was thus developed a case expression for these relations, incorporated in the principal clause, and giving as part of it an idea that would otherwise have to be expressed by a subordinate clause. While logical exactness may not be attained, greater variety and picturesqueness certainly are, and this is the essence of the nature of the cases, in fact of all early inflections. It is left for the later language to make everything accurate and logically clear.

Though not a common construction in Homer, its use there warrants the assumption that it was at least quite familiar and well known. The aorist has begun to be used. According to Classen there are 28 examples of present participle in the Iliad and 24 in the Odyssey; of the aorist 17 in the Il. and 4 in the Od. = 52 present and 21 aor. From the fact that we have such a difference between the Il. and Od. in the number of aorists, Classen rightly remarks that it is unsafe to draw conclusions. Had there been no example of the aor. in the Od. and a large number in the Iliad the case would be different. Of the 21 aor. examples, Classen says 7 are temporal and 14 hypothetical; of the 52 pres. participles 30 express time, 22 condition. He himself felt how difficult it is to draw the line; priority of time, and cause are easily confused, and a cause thrown into the future is apt to assume a hypothetical character, so a temporal participle followed by a verb in the future, or in a clause with *ἵνα* and the like, may seem conditional. Observe the first example given by Classen: Θ 164, *ἔρρε, κακὴ γλήνη, ἐπεὶ οὐκ εἶξαντος ἐμεῖο | πύργων ἡμετέρων ἐπιβήσεται*. The temporal notion seems sufficiently plain here, and there is no need of calling up a relation that was more frequently prominent only in the later period. La Roche translates: 'nachdem ich vor dir gewichen bin.' Take x 383, *ἢ καταλείψουσιν πόλιν ἄκρην τοῦδε πεσόντος*, where it might seem natural

to regard it as conditional, but it can be temporal as well, and no doubt was so at this time. All the cases in the *Il.* and *Od.* will be found on examination to be easy. Only once are two gens. abs. put together, *v* 312; several repetitions of the same example occur, and in a few examples of those given by Classen we need not consider them as abs. at all, according to what has been said above; such examples are *O* 191, *Ξ* 521, *Φ* 523, *X* 47, *Ψ* 599—*δ* 392, *ι* 390, *ξ* 294 = *λ* 295, *ω* 507. The last example Classen himself admits can be looked upon as partitive. In the later language these would be felt as absolute, not at this time. If Classen chooses to consider *O* 191, *ἡ τοι ἐγὼν ἔλαχον πολὴν ἄλα ναιέμεν αἰεὶ | παλλομένων*, he should also class cases like *E* 665 (given above) so too. Even cases like *a* 16, *ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἔτος ἦλθε περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν* may still be felt as dependent genitives. If we consider all these things we find the number given by *Cl.*, itself not large, somewhat reduced. There is no case of the use of the fut. participle in Homer, as there is no case of *ὥς* with the gen. abs., nor is the perfect participle used except in a present sense.

Before leaving Homer we may notice his use of a participle without a noun. This may occur at all periods of the language when the subject is general or is readily understood from what goes before, just as with the finite verb the subject is sometimes not expressed when it is sufficiently plain; so *ἀναγνώσεται, δείξει* (cf. *Her.* 2, 96, *ἀπίει*). Examples are rare in Homer: *Δ* 458, *αἶμα δέ οἱ σπασθέντος ἀνέσσυτο*, where *ἔγχεος* is readily supplied from the preceding (*Zenodot.* reads *οὐ*). *Σ* 606 and *δ* 19 are alike: *δοιῶ δὲ κυβιστητῆρε κατ' αὐτοὺς | μολπῆς ἐξάρχοντος ἐδίνεον κατὰ μέσσους*. Here all the editors since Wolf, who follows *Athenaeus*, *V* 180, have the gen.; the MSS, however, and *Aristarchus* give *ἐξάρχοντες*. Now while what *Athen.* says may be true, it is certain that *Aristarchus*, an acute critic, felt that the nom. plur. was better for Homer than the gen. sing. The other two examples in Classen's list are not real cases: *O* 191 (cited above), where *παλλομένων* is partitive, and is so explained by *La Roche*, and in *Ψ* 521, *ὁ δέ τ' ἄγχι μάλα τρέχει οὐδέ τι πολλή | χώρη μεσσηγύς, πολέος πεδίοιο θέοντος*, after *οὐδέ τι*, as though *αὐτοῦ* had been expressed, the sentence continues with the gen., which is made easier by the use of *μεσσηγύς*. Even if we admit some of these cases it would be rare in Homer. Classen also mentions a number of gen. participles following a noun in the dative or accusative. If we examine those with the dative, and it will require no close study, we shall find the change made in every

case there where the gen. and dat. express in the main the same general idea, *i. e.* with nouns, *e. g.* Ξ 25, $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \sigma\phi\iota\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \chi\rho\omicron\iota\ \chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\iota\rho\eta\varsigma\ |\ \nu\upsilon\sigma\sigma\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu\ \xi\acute{\iota}\phi\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\ \tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \xi\gamma\chi\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\phi\iota\gamma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\sigma\iota\nu$, what could be more natural than that as the verse went on the gen. should be used? The general idea is what the writer has in mind. All the examples will be found to be like this. With the accusative he knows but two examples: δ 646, $\eta\ \sigma\epsilon\ \beta\acute{\iota}\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\epsilon\kappa\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\upsilon\rho\alpha\ \nu\eta\alpha\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\iota\nu\alpha\nu$, Υ 413, $\tau\omicron\nu\ \beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\iota\ \pi\omicron\delta\acute{\alpha}\rho\kappa\eta\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \text{'}\chi\iota\lambda\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ |\ \nu\acute{\omega}\tau\alpha\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$. In both these cases the use of the gen. case is readily explained: in the second case when $\nu\acute{\omega}\tau\alpha$ is reached the writer goes on as though it had been $\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\ \nu\acute{\omega}\tau\alpha$, which is certainly the general sense, and the genitive follows naturally; it is not a case of forgetfulness with regard to the sense, but as in κ 187 (*cf. supra*), adherence to the same; in the first case there is sufficient cause for the gen. in the use of $\beta\acute{\iota}\eta$, *cf.* Λ 430, where La Roche treats these cases in the way mentioned. Such gens. then cannot be regarded as abs. in Homer, nor indeed would Cl. have resorted to this explanation had he not labored under the belief that in the early language the use of a gen. abs. brought out the relation of time, cause, etc., more prominently.

In the poets after Homer we notice at first the same use as in that author: in the *Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι* of Hesiod (the only one of the works assigned to the poet that is genuine) there is a somewhat larger number, but of the same kind, as 386, $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\pi\lambda\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon$, 383, $\Pi\lambda\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$. In the early elegiac poets, Callinus, Tyrtaeus, Solon, we meet but few examples, a fact due in part to the absence of occasion for the use of the construction, but not altogether. Indeed, there is plenty of room left for its use had it been familiar. In all these early poets the kind is the same as that in Homer.¹ Here, as elsewhere, the norm for poetry once set was adhered to, and though the later prose use influenced the poetry of that period to some extent, we can say that throughout its frequent occurrence was a mark of prose, while poetry preserved in general the limits set by Homer and the early poets, limits that

¹ Mr. C. W. E. Miller, who has been making a special study of the participle in Pindar, reports 31 perfectly certain gens. abs., 5 not certain and 3 very doubtful occurrences, in all 39. Of the 39, 27 are active, 5 middle and 7 passive. There are 20 aorists and 19 presents; so that we have a balance, which, indeed, is a relative advance on Homer, but not the great advance which might have supposed to be shown by Erdmann's defective lists. Hence correct my statement in Introduction to Pindar, p. cxii. The examples, especially the aorist examples, are found chiefly in narrative.—B. L. G.

to them were natural. Had the popular use not been much more restricted than that of some of the prose writers we might expect it even more. In the lyric parts of the tragedies, the choral odes, we find the same use. In the Persae and Agamemnon of Aeschylus there occur only Pers. 283, which might depend on πάντα and Ag. 1451 and 1563, both simply temporal. (Ag. 260 the chorus speaks in iambic trimeters, this example is therefore not to be counted here.) Similarly in Soph. Antigone and Oed. Col., chosen as specimens of different periods of his life, we find Ant. 340, 1134 (1532). In Oed. Col. 1565, πολλῶν γὰρ ἂν καὶ μάταν πημάτων ἰκνουμένων | πάλιν σφιδάιμων δίκαιος αἶψοι, the gen. at first glance might seem abs., but it is really used, as Schneidewin and Nauck say, like τίσασθαι τινά τινος.¹ In six of Euripides' plays, different in time of composition and kind of play, I found the following: Alcestis 466, seemingly a gen. abs., but as there is a break it is difficult to say (Hipp. 800, iambic trimeter), Bacchae, Cyclops, Orestes, no examples, Medea (863). While this is not exhaustive for the choruses, it is enough to show the general use. Nor is it frequently used in the trimeter parts, the percentage varying between .04 and .30. The Bacchae, for instance, that exquisite production of Euripides' later life, contains but three examples, but these show the advances made; 627, ὡς ἐμοῦ πεφηνγός—773, οἶνον δὲ μηκέτ' ὄντος—1243, μακάριος εἰ ἡμῶν τὰδ' ἐξεργασμένων. Alc. and Medea have more, the former 16, the latter 9; from the nature of the former we should have expected a larger number than in other dramas.

It is, however, in classic Attic prose that the construction finds its full use. The earliest prose we possess is as a rule so fragmentary that we cannot well decide as to its use there. From what we have we may draw the inference that while its use is not

¹ Dr. Goodell, in his valuable paper, 'On the Genitive Case in Sophocles' (Tr. Am. Phil. Assoc. 1884), gives the following statistic for gen. absol.:

	<i>Ai.</i>	<i>O. T.</i>	<i>O. K.</i>	<i>Ant.</i>	<i>El.</i>	<i>Tr.</i>	<i>Phil.</i>	<i>Total.</i>	<i>Total.</i>
Dial.	11	16	11	6	10	14	6	74	} 84
Lyr.	3	1	0	2	2	1	1	10	

He too considers the genitive absolute as a development of the predicate adnominal genitive. Unfortunately he does not give the tenses employed. As participles standing alone he cites τελουμένων, El. 1344; καθανόντος, Ant. 909. The case-register of Sophokles is so peculiar that it would be unsafe to draw conclusions from his usage, and besides no one has been at the pains to do for Sophokles what Mr. C. W. E. Miller has done for Aristophanes (see Johns Hopkins University Circulars, No. 25), so that we cannot tell what is the real proportion of dialogue to lyric in him.—B. L. G.

a large one, other relations besides that of time begin to become prominently used so, especially condition. Time is, however, throughout, and naturally so, the reigning relation expressed. This being so, we might expect it more largely in narrations, and we should not be deceived, for where there is much narration there are ordinarily, relatively speaking, a large number of genitives abs. Consequently the historians always show fair percentages; it is in most cases over 1.00, generally 1.50, sometimes even more; in didactic prose, where, to be sure, there is to some extent less occasion for it, the percentage is far less, in some few cases indeed none at all; in such works its use is avoided where it would be possible to have it. Descriptions, too, do not show so many. This will be patent to any one on reading *e. g.* Her. lib. I; in the narrative portions there are quite many, but in the description of the Ionians, of Babylon and its customs, in lib. II, of Egypt, etc., there are far less.

In the Orators, of whose use I wish to speak in particular, we find the greatest possible variety both in manner and frequency of use. Certainly no other set of authors could be chosen whose works would so well illustrate the various uses of this construction; whatever could be done with it they did. Easy in the beginning, it grew in the hands of some of them to be quite complex, and though not so used by the people, they used it in ways that would have been impossible in any other language, and that in some cases were rarely used by any of the Greeks themselves. First then, let us look at the relative frequency of the construction in the different orators in their several speeches. Beginning with Antiphon, the first of the canon, we find the use somewhat limited. Omitting the tetralogies, which besides being mere sketches, are so short that one can hardly draw inferences from percentages, we find in V and VI respectively .79 and .58, small percentages when we consider the length of each, and especially of the narrative parts.¹ Andocides, in his great speech I, uses it like Antiphon,

¹ In this and the following I have used the ordinary Teubner texts; where the pages were not full, allowance was made, counting 32 lines to the page. In all cases where part of the space is taken up by psephisms, etc., due allowance was made. Absolute accuracy in such matters is difficult to attain to, but the following figures are as near it as could be brought about by careful calculation. Every case of a noun and an accompanying participle has been regarded as one example (including, of course, cases where the subject is omitted), where, therefore, several participles accompany one noun, or vice versa, the whole has been treated as one example. Hyperides was not examined on account of the unsatisfactory nature of what remains of his speeches.

but in II, III and IV the percentage is over 1.00. In Lysias large percentages are found, partly, but not altogether, because there is more occasion for its use. In his several speeches there is some variety; many are so short and fragmentary that it is hardly worth while to consider them. Most of the important speeches, 1, 3, 7, 12, 16, 19, show large proportions, so too the spurious 2d. To this rule the 13th forms a marked exception; the difference between it and the 12th is striking; though they hardly differ at all in length, the percentages are 1.52 and .26. This is entirely in accord with the nature of the speeches. The 13th, as Blass has shown (*Att. Bereds.* I, p. 562), is throughout different from the great 12th; it is a plain speech, lacking all adornment, and so ordinarily where there might be occasion for the use of the construction the expression is resolved into a subordinate clause. This low percentage becomes more significant when we remember that it is the shortest of all the speeches except *Isocr.* 1, 2, and *Dem.* 13, which are entirely different in character.

Of all the orators Lysurgus uses the construction in the simplest, most natural way. Like Andocides he approaches the popular use, indeed even more so; the cases are all easy, and one-third of all are found in the story of Codrus. In Aeschines there is a great difference between the second speech and the other two, the gen. abs. occurring in the former more than twice as frequently as in either of the other two, while all are quite long. This is due somewhat to cases of the use of many at a time in the speech *περὶ παραπρεσβείας*, but without regarding this the difference is noticeable. Isocrates uses it largely in 16, 18, 17, 19, while his carefully elaborated works do not rise so high, contrary to what we might expect from his fondness for putting together many participles. Dinarchus in his first speech has a large number, in 2 and 3 not many.

It is in Demosthenes, of all the orators, that we find every possible variety in frequency of use. Somewhat oddly the extremes meet in 12 and [13], while in the letter of Philip, 12, the percentage is 3.73, in [13] it is only 11, a very low percentage for prose, and about the same as *Isocr.* 1; next to [13] stands [60], another spurious production, where the percentage is .29. That the speech covers but ten pages has, perhaps, something to do with this, but we see what can be done in less than ten pages in the speech against Callicles (55), one of the genuine private orations. There we find 3.33, next to 12 the highest percentage in Demosthenes. Then

follow 33, 50, 47, 44, 32, 49, which are all regarded as spurious some of them bad imitations with wearisome repetitions. The next genuine speech to 55 is 29 (against Aphobos for Phanos) with 2.03. The great speeches observe a mean between the ordinary use and the large use in some of the private orations. Of other writers the following may be mentioned: Thuc. in bk. 1 has 1.60, in bk. 7, 1, 1.48, the others average no doubt 1.50. In Herodotus we find about the same percentages. Plato stands between .30 and .70 in his works. The tone is either conversational or argumentative, and in neither case should we expect large numbers. In the Republic the percentage is about .44, varying slightly in the different books, the most are found in the 6th and the least in the 1st, Sympos. .59, Phaedr. .50, etc. In Aristophanes the number is small, the average varies between .10 in *Lysistr.*, *Thesm.* and *Ran.*, and .23 in *Nub.* *Eccl.*, the others stand between these limits.

After the classic period the gen. abs. was used in about the same way, in narrative oftener, in didactic argumentative works less frequently; such frequency as we find in some of the orators is probably nowhere reached. In the N. T. the same rule holds. The evangelists show large numbers between .70 and 1.15; St. John alone falling as low as .30. In the Epistles, all didactic, there are but few, many indeed have no examples at all: epp. to the Phil., Coloss., 2 Thess., 1 and 2 Tim., Philemon, Titus, James, 1 and 2 John, Jude. The others have but few except Hebrews with .70. So much for the frequency of the use of the construction.

If, as we saw, the gen. abs. began with the relation of time as the prominent, and indeed only one expressed, with a preference for the present participle, at the time of which we are now speaking all such distinction or preference had been wiped out, and the aorist was used with the same ease as the present, in fact narrative often shows a larger number of the former. The perfect does not occur so frequently, and many of these are virtually present, as *εἰδώς*, etc. When they are real perfects the idea is ordinarily that of time, but cause may be involved.¹

Taken altogether the percentage of the various tenses in the

¹ From Classen's note on Thuc. 1, 114, it might seem that he means that the perfect is used only in purely temporal relations. But cf. Isaeus, 7, 2, *δόντων τῶν νόμων*, with 7, 17, *δεδοκότων τῶν νόμων*; the perfect too is sometimes used side by side with the aor., both apparently equally causal, as Dem. 50, 22.

orators (exc. Hyp.) was found to be as follows: present, 52.9 per cent.; aorist, 31.5 per cent.; perfect, 14.9 per cent.; future, 0.7 per cent. Of the voices the act. has 64.85 per cent., the middle 20.95 per cent., and the passive 14.2 per cent. In the middle and passive the aor. predominates, in the passive the perfect also surpasses the present. The speeches in which the aor. is found oftener than the present are, Lys. 4, 16, 20, 32; Isocr. 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12; Is. 5, 10; Dem. 26, 32, 33, 38, 40, 41, 52, 56, 59; Lyc. in Leocr.; Din. 1, 2. In many cases the difference is not great; most, it will be seen, are in the private speeches, where these aorists occur largely in narration. In the same way we find *e. g.* in (N. T.) Matth. nearly twice as many aorists as presents. More perfects than aorists are found in Lys. 1, 10, 18, 25, 26; Isocr. 7, 11; Is. 4, 11; Dem. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 31, 38, 44, 53. This includes perfects in form with present signification, as *εἰδώς*, also *ἦκων*, *κείμενος* and *καθήμενος*. The future occurs very rarely indeed, and generally with *ὥς* or *ὥσπερ*. These will be treated later, but there still remain three cases without *ὥς*, they are the following: Is. 7, 42, *εἰκότως ἂν ποιήσαισθε πρόνοιαν ἄλλως τε καὶ τούτων . . . οἶκον ἀνηρηκότων καὶ πεπρακότων καὶ ἔρημον πεποιηκότων ἡμῶν δὲ λειψουργηκότων καὶ λειψουργησόντων, ἂν ὑμεῖς ἐπικυρώσητε . . .* Dem. 24, 189, *ἀλλὰ μὴ περὶ τούτων ὑμῶν οἰσόντων τὴν ψῆφον τί δεῖ . . . ἐνοχλεῖν*, and 45, 12, *προσμαρτυρούντων δὲ τούτων καὶ τῶν δικαστῶν ὁμοίως ἀκουσομένων τί ἦν μοι κέρδος τὸ μὴ ἐθέλειν*. All three of these go counter to the ordinary uses of the future participle, and the second is even more unusual in that it represents *εἰ* with the future indic.; it may well be questioned whether another such example can be found anywhere in Greek.

In the century during which the orators wrote the conditional use of the participle in the gen. abs. is quite familiar; without a negative, we may almost always be in doubt as to which relation was uppermost in the writer's mind, but when *μή* is used, unless indeed its use is brought about by a preceding conditional conjunction, verb in the imperative, or the like, the matter is made more certain. In later Greek *μή* is used without conditional notion, even without its being induced by some one of the words mentioned. Sometimes too in classic Greek *μή* seems to be so used without conditional value, as in Dem. 18, 166, in Philip's reply, *μή* is used in a causal sense, but it may be construed with the inf. following *βουλομένων*, while in Is. 5, 16, *ἐτέρως μηδεμίης ὁμολογουμένης εἶναι, μή* follows *ὁμολογουμένης* grammatically as the

regular negative used after that verb. In Dem. 22, 36, after the conjunction *εἰ* we have first *μηδέν* followed by *οὐδέ*, notwithstanding the influence of the conjunction. Generally the relation of condition is expressed by a subordinate clause. We find in easy style but few gen. abs. that express this relation: in Lysias, 7,21 9,20 12,45,85 19,24,53, these are in fact all. Of *μή* with the participle we find in Ant. four examples, in And. two, in Isaeus three, in Lysias two (underlined above), in Aeschines one. Demosthenes uses it more freely, but still not a few speeches, especially in private suits, have none whatever. In the N. T. it occurs a few times, but not as conditional: Matth. 13,19 (probably temporal), 18,25; Luke, 7,42 14,29 (after *ἵνα*); Acts, 19,40 21,14.34 27,7.20 (followed by *οὐ*, but in the expression *χειμῶνος οὐκ ὀλίγον ἐπικειμένον*, where the words *οὐκ ὀλίγον* are felt as one); Rom. 5,13 9,11; 1 Cor. 4,18 (*ὥς*); 2 Cor. 4,18; 1 Pet. 4,4, all are temporal, causal or concessive. To sum up, then, the expression of condition by the participle finds its most frequent use in carefully elaborated works, is not extensively used there, and except in certain fixed expressions was not much used in easy style and conversation.

The concessive relation may be brought out more prominently by the use of the word *ὅμως*, and rendered undoubted by the use of *καίπερ*. This is found with the gen. abs. in Isocr. 9,11; Dem. 1,10 pr., 5,3 pr., 18,145 pr., 44,25.32.65 27,44 29,28 61,28; Aesch. 1,45. *καίτοι* in this sense is extremely rare in good prose, *e. g.* Pl. Rep. 511 D, common enough in the later period, once in N. T. Hebr. 4,3. The words *καὶ ταῦτα* also generally, though not necessarily, give concessive force to the participle; they are found Is. 3,38.76 4,8 10,23; Isocr. 15,250; Dem. 20,96 21,119 24,26 34,17 48,54 56,40; Din. 1,100. Another expression often found with the gen. abs., as with the participle in any construction, is *ἄλλως τε καὶ*, which does not fix any relation, but practically excludes the concessive. We find it: Ant. 1,5; And. 4,9; Lys. 7,36; Is. 3,46 7,42; Isocr. 5,45 6,3.37 7,8 12,37 17,52; Dem. 3,12 17,25 20,144 59,48.

Being a participial construction, the gen. abs. is often combined by conjunctions quite closely with participles in other constructions occurring in the sentence. We do not find this in Homer, and in lyric poetry, if at all, but rarely; in the orators, however, it is met with quite frequently, and was often resorted to as a means of balancing the sentence; examples are: Ant. 2 γ 10 5,47, *οὔτε τῆς πόλεως ψηφισαμένης οὔτε αὐτόχειρα ὄντα* 6,9 And. 1,2 3,20; Lys. 2,8.37

3,25 4,11 6,45 7,41.43 12,2.6.9 14,2.38 18,5 19,23.26 20,19 25,31 27,11; Is. 1,4.9.14.41 2,37 3,36 4,23 7,11.15.44 8,1 10,23 12,2; Isocr. 3,19 4,93.142.148 6,8.23.24.44.56.86 8,117 9,55 12,89.102 13,27 14,28 16,9.45 17,39; Dem. 3,27 12,22 19,218 20,137 21,5.49.117 23,156.164.192 29,13 30,28.33 32,8.9.26 34,37.(50) 35,4 (of same person) 36,43 37,7.12.40 45,68 47,15.30.81 49,13.47 50,6.21.68 52,12 55,2.21.26 57,42 59,55; Aesch. 1,78 2,169.176 3,34.90; Lyc. in Leocr. 99, *χρήσαντος δ' αὐτῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ δὲ πειθόμενος τοῦτ' ἐπραξε*. Here *δε* is used like the Homeric *δέ* in apodosis.¹

With a participle in other constructions, but without a connecting conjunction, we find the participle of the gen. abs. somewhat oftener. It will suffice to give a few from each orator: And. 1,106.109.138 4,13; Lys. 2,7.13.29, etc.; Is. 3,2 5,11, etc.; Isocr. 3,28 4,72, etc.; Dem. 18,149.151.166.322, etc.; Aesch. 1,60.104.108.180, etc.; Lyc. in Leocr. 87.99. There are very few examples to be found in Ant., And., Lyc. and Dinarchus.

Very often it happens that one noun in the genitive abs. has several participles agreeing with it, and vice versa, though not so often, several nouns accompany one participle. In the matter of agreement the former presents no difficulty, the latter varies somewhat in this respect. As a rule the participle agrees with the nearest noun, *e. g.* And. 1,138, *τρίηρων αἰὲ κατὰ θάλατταν οὐσῶν καὶ ληστῶν*—Isocr. 7,8; Is. 1,4 2,29 5,7, *στάσεως γενομένης κάγωνος*, 6,21 (8,44) 10,4.5 11,30; Lys. 2,35 6,45 (19,44); Dem. 3,4 9,57 16,4 19,75.126 21,85.127 23,130.173 *παραγενομένου Ἀθηνοδώρου καὶ τῶν βασιλείων* 24,140 36,23 29,57 33,33 34,37 38,6 40,6 47,193 (49,22) (52,7) 55,15; Aesch. (1,43.162, 2,47.137) 2,36.138 3,45.113, etc. This does not include such cases as would have the same participle, as, *e. g.* two plural nouns. In some cases a plural (or dual) participle agrees with two or more sing. nouns, or with a sing. and a plural noun, though nearer the former, *e. g.* Lys. 2,7 3,6, *ἐνδον οὐσῶν τῆς τε ἀδελφιδῆς καὶ τῶν ἀδελφιδῶν*, 12,72; Isocr. 5,95 11,11; Dem. 23,170 25,68 49,13.24, *ἀφικομένων Ἀλκίου καὶ Ἰάσωνος* (but 49,22, *ἀφικομένου γὰρ Ἀλκίου καὶ Ἰάσωνος . . . βοηθησόντων*) 31 59,99; Aesch. 2,26.176, etc. With these compare such cases as Lys. 19,44; Dem. 23,173 47,19 59,97; Aesch. 1,43 2,26, etc.

Practically in this, as in most cases, the Greek wrote as he

¹ Blass, *Att. Bereds.* I, p. 210, seems to think that Thuc. 1,2.2, *τῆς γὰρ ἐμπορίας οὐκ οὐσης οὐδ' ἐπιμεινύντες ἀδεῶς ἀλλήλοις* would have been written by a later writer so as to make the construction of both members similar, but notice the large number of cases cited above from Dem., etc.

deemed best for the purposes of rhythm, etc. The former case, in which several participles are found with one noun, is more frequently met and occurs in all the orators. It does not, however, appear so often as one might suppose on general impressions.

So far we have regarded the subject of the gen. abs. as a noun or pronoun, personal or demonstrative, used in its stead, but the Greeks went farther than this and even made relative and interrogative pronouns the subject; this is, however, again one of the possibilities of the construction not often made use of. We find the relative pronoun in Lys. 33,9; Isocr. 3,7, *ὃν μὴ διαταχθέντων*, 4,122.189 5,71 6,48 7,2.51 9,68 10,49 12,116 15,107.255; Dem. 5,13 9,56 14,1 18,306 20,60 39,9. (In And. 2,3, Dem. 27,29 and Aesch. 3,258, the gen. can be regarded as depending on other words.) It will be seen that Isocrates is fond of this use, he has twice as many examples as Dem. Except the one case in Lysias the other orators do not use the relative in this way. The relative pronoun may also be object of the participle, as Isocr. 10,27, *τὸ τέρας ᾧ . . . δασμὸν τῆς πόλεως ἀποστελλούσης*—Dem. 18,132, *ὃν λαβόντος ἐμοῦ* (18,323 the rel. may be taken with the principal verb)—Din. 1,20, *οἷς ἐτοίμων ὄντων βοηθεῖν*, οἷς is governed by the infinitive depending on the participle. The subject of the gen. abs. may be the omitted antecedent of a relative in the sentence, as in Latin 'missis qui.' This does not occur often: Dem. 18,249, *συστάντων οἷς ἦν ἐπιμελές*, 25,54 34,31 36,22 (Plat. Rep. 467 B, 469 D).

Sometimes an interrogative pronoun is subject or object of the partic. in a gen. abs., just as we find it with the participle in other constructions, *e. g.* *τί δρῶν εἰς ἕχθος ἦλθον*. This too occurs rarely: Lys. 10,23 = 11,8; Is. 10,2; Dem. 21,143 (27,51 61,36 indir.). As object it is found: Dem. 2,25 19,75 23,107 37,14 47,43. Indirect interrogatives with relative word are found: Isocr. 16,16, *ἀναμνήσθητε ὡς ἐχόντων τῶν πραγμάτων κτέ*; Dem. 4,3 19,61, 40,54, 50,21.57; Aesch. 1,20. Both the relative and the interrogative in this place are evidences of the great advance made in the use of the construction since the time of Homer. Another such evidence, and even more rarely found, is the use of the articular infinitive as subject of the gen. abs. In the orators this occurs but five times: Lys. 12,13, *ὡς τοῦ γε ἀποθανεῖν ὑπάρχοντος*—Isocr. 3, 6, *ἐγγενομένου . . . τοῦ πείθειν*, 6,3, *ἄλλως τε καὶ τοῦ γινῶναι . . . καθεστῶτος*—15,254, *ἐγγενομένου . . . τοῦ πείθειν*, which looks like a reminiscence of 3,6; Dem. 5,2. The examples of this use are altogether rare. Plato has a few, as Crito, 49 D; Euthyd. 285 D; Gorg. 509 C. Thuc. has at least

one, 3,12.3, and from Dr. Nicolassen I learn that it occurs but once in Xenophon's works.¹ The use of an articular infinitive in this connection shows to what extent the language could make use of its existing material, and what possibilities it kept in reserve, even though it used them but rarely.

A word now as to the order of the words in this construction. In general we may lay down the seemingly evident rule that the emphatic word is put in the emphatic place, but this would be somewhat vague. In narration, where the action is generally that to which attention is called, we find a large number of the type *εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ ταῦτα, φευγόντων δὲ τούτων*, etc., *i. e.* with participle preceding. In expressions of time, like *χειμῶνος ὄντος, ἡμέρας γενομένης*, etc., where the noun is the important element, it is generally put ahead; still, though this may be given as a rule, it is sometimes violated. In orators like Dem., and especially Isocrates, regard is generally had to rhythm, hiatus, etc. Usage varies in this matter, while in Her. bk. 1 about 55 per cent. are of the type first mentioned, in Thuc. bk. 7 there are but 43 per cent.; again, in the N. T. they constitute 63 per cent. The same holds in the orators: in Antiphon about 40 per cent., in Andoc. 48 per cent., etc. It is impossible to trace any fixed law beyond what has been said.

In the early stages of the language the dependency of any genitive with a participle on some noun or verb was clearly felt and expected, when the governing word had not yet been uttered; in the period, however, of which we are speaking, the absolute use had become so familiar and frequent that such a gen., even though really depending on a word in the sentence, was felt for awhile as absolute; the mind referring it to the absolute use until the contrary was proved, instead of holding the matter in suspense for the time being; on the other hand, even if the governing word preceded, if the gen. had the form of a gen. abs., it was probably often felt so even though the reader knew very well that it depended on another word. This is what Classen contended to be true for Homer. It must not be understood that such uses are really absolute; they stand on the borderland and mediate between the two, the mind recognizing both, *e. g.* Ant. 2 β 12, *τοιούτου δ' ὄντος μηδὲν ἀνόσιον καταγνώτε*. In early Greek this would have been held in suspense until *καταγνώτε* was pronounced, but at the time of the orators it was felt as absolute until the verb was reached; the

¹ See A. J. P., IV 242, for additional examples from Plato and the orators. Also see III 198.

general effect, however, of the absolute use had been produced. In examples like Ant. 5,43, *πεπραγμένου μοι τοῦ ἔργου μάρτυρας καὶ συμβούλους ἐποιούμην*, the absolute feeling is still more prominent.

The ordinary use of a participle with a noun not in the gen. abs., as above said, is also capable of expressing time, cause, etc., and does so, still these relations do not appear so prominent but they are subordinated. In the abs. construction, however, this is quite different, the expression of these relations is there the prominent feature, which became more essential the more the construction was gradually felt as the equivalent of a subordinate clause; consequently it happens that to secure definiteness without having recourse to such a clause, a gen. abs. may occur in a sentence in which the subject of the gen. abs. is also subject or object of the verb or of a preposition. This may occur (1) with the noun repeated, or (2) without such repetition.

I. The subject is found repeated most frequently in the oblique cases, but also a few times in the nominative, *e. g.* Dem. 52,5, *ἀποκριναμένου δὲ Φορμίωνος . . . ἔφη ὁ Φορμίων* (easy conversational style) 59,7 (cf. Her. 2,11, where the two are separated at some length). With other cases we find this repetition: *With the genitive*, Dem. (10,53 dep. on adj.) 52,15 53,18, *βουλομένων τῶν δικαστῶν . . . ἐδείχθη ἐγὼ τῶν δικαστῶν*; Isocr. 17,35; with preposition: And. 1,20 2,10, *ὥστε ὑμῶν ἐκόντων εἶναι (= ἐξεῖναι) ποτέ μοι πολιτεῦσασθαι μεθ' ὑμῶν* 3,25; Dem. 8,66=10,68 54,42; N. T. Rom. 5,8; with noun: Dem. 47,32. *With the dative*, after verb: And. 3,31, *ταῦτα δὲ πασχόντων ἡμῶν οἱ πείσαντες ἡμᾶς τίνα ὠφέλειαν παρέσχον ἡμῖν*—Dem. 18,20 23,167 47,69 50,31.36.37.40.49.56; N. T. Luke, 22,10; Acts, 16,16; 2 Cor. 4,18; Arist. Av. 562. After preposition: Isocr. 12,8 (Dem. 43,79, separated); N. T. 1 Cor. 11,18. *With the accusative*, after the verb: Lys. 21,25; Dem. 18,143 19,211 21,76 23,89 35,46 40,53 50,34-55 56,11 59,52.61; Aesch. 2,43, *ἀναισθήτως δὲ ἡμῶν ἐχόντων καὶ τὴν ἐπιβουλήν οὐ προορωμένων . . . κατέκλεσεν ἡμᾶς*—N. T. Acts, 21,17 22,17. After preposition: Dem. 45,40 53,6 56,40 59,68; Aesch. 3,123; N. T. Luke 22,53; 2 Cor. 12,21. In some of these cases the gen. abs. follows, especially with *ὥς*, as Dem. 21,76 35,46 45,40 52,15 56,40.¹

Instead of the same word we often find *αὐτός*, *οὗτος* or *ἐκεῖνος*

¹ In Dem. 35,4 the dat. precedes, and, connected with it by a conjunction, is the gen. abs.: *ἀδελφῶ ὄντι τούτῳ . . . καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἔχοντος τούτου δεῖξαι νόμον*—N. T. Acts, 22,17, is strange: *ἐγένετο δὲ μοι ὑποστρέψαντι καὶ προσερχομένου μου γενέσθαι με*.

referring to the subject of the gen. abs. in a different case construction. This is not so striking as the preceding case; it occurs quite frequently.

Examples of *αὐτός* so used are: *Genitive*, Ant. 4,8.10; And. 1,5; Lys. 7,7; Is. 7,8; Isocr. 6,47 (10,39 subj. of gen. abs. omitted) 10,60 (12,100) 16,10 οὕτως ἀνόμως τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπεσόντος ὡς δεινὰ δεδρακότος αὐτοῦ κατηγοροῦσι, 18,5; Dem. 23,154 40,17; Lyc. in Leocr. 86; N. T. Matth. 5,1 12,46; Luke, 24,36; Acts, 17,16 28,3. *Dative*, And. 1,67 4,17; Lys. 2,44 13,26 20,26 22,8; Isocr. 6,18 10,20 14,57 15,112 17,37 19,18; Dem. 15,11 23,107.202 27,36 42,27 50,36.49.50; Aesch. 1,104; Din. 2,18; N. T. Matth. 8,1.5.28 9,18 17,22.26 18,21 21,23, 26,6 27,17; Mark, 5,2 9,9 13,1; Luke, 14,29 24,41; John, 4,51 14,22; Acts, 4,1 13,42 17,16. *Accusative*, Ant. 3,γ.11, μετόχου τοῦ μειρακίου τοῦ φόνου ὄντος οὐκ ἂν δικαίως οὐδὲ ὅσῳς ἀπολύοιτε αὐτόν—Lys. 32,4; Isocr. (4,140) 7,76 11,49 (15,310); Dem. 5,2 15,11 18,33 (21,176) 23,183 24,43 28,1 47,58 49,32 50,55 58,28 59,31 60,102; Aesch. 2,28; N. T. Matth. 18,25 22,24 27,19; Mark, 5,2.18.21 9,28 10,17 13,3; Luke, 9,42 15,20 18,40 19,33 24,5; John, 8,30 12,37; Acts, 7,21 18,6 19,30 25,7.21 28,17. *οὗτος* and *ἐκεῖνος* do not occur so often. *Genitive*, Isocr. 5,43 9,12 12,89 (16,11 with noun); Is. 3,50 9,20 11,38; Dem. 11,34 34,38.47 44,55 53,25 58,42. *Dative*, Isocr. 12,8.57.189 15,53 18,60; Dem. 23,56.149 25,17. *Accusative*, Is. 3,50; Dem. 20,82 57,28. Sometimes, as in Isocr. 4,134, *αὐτός* etc. itself appears in the gen. abs., the noun in another case construction. From these lists it will be seen that of the several cases the dative occurs most frequently in this way, next the acc. and genitive, the nom. but rarely.

II. When the subject of the gen. abs. is not repeated, a case which is possible only with verbs, this irregularity is still more prominent. In some of the cases the verb can be looked upon as absolutely used without object, but there are some in which this is not the case, and these leave the possibility of a doubt as to the conception in the others. This use, however, does not occur so frequently as the one we have just considered. First we look at the cases where we should expect the nominative: Dem. 42,8, τὸ μὲν ἀφελεῖν τὸ σημεῖον ὁμολογεῖ, τὸ δὲ ἀνοῖξαι τὴν θύραν οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ ὥσπερ ἄλλου τινὸς ἔνεκα ἀφαιρῶντος ἢ τοῦ τὰς θύρας ἀνοῖξαι, 58,31 29,52 43,67. The same is found in other writers: Pl. Phaedr. 232 C; Her. 1,90 91.96; N. T. Matth. 1,18, μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν

αὐτοὺς εὐρέθη κτέ; Mark, 6,22 (Cod. Vat.); Acts, 21,34 28,6; Hebr. 11,4 (Cod. Alex.)¹ The gen. cannot be used in this way, for as no noun is repeated it would be not an absolute, but a dependent genitive. The dative might be expected in Ant. 1,12; Is. 1,32 6,45; Dem. 6,20 12,15 18,294 22,16 24,138 58,27 59,7; Aesch. 1,146; Arist. Ran. 128; Vesp. 746; N. T. Matth. 17,24; Luke, 17,12; Acts, 24,25. In most of these cases the verb may be looked upon as used absolutely. A well-known example of the expected accusative occurs Dem. 18,135, οὐκοῦν ὅτε τούτου μέλλοντος λέγειν ἀπήλασεν ἡ βουλή καὶ προσέταξεν ἐτέρῳ. Here most MSS read αὐτόν, but Σ omits it; the Scholiast (acc. to Westermann) stigmatizes this as a σύνταξις ἐπικίνδυνος καὶ σολοικοφανής. When we remember that it occurs in one of the ablest productions of the Greek mind, written by one who well knew how to use his language, we cannot follow him so readily. It must be plain now why the gen. is used; it brings out more prominently the participle and the temporal idea; in the acc. the stress would have been on τοῦτον, and the participle with its temporal notion more in the background. Nor is this a solitary instance, it occurs Lys. 12,64 19,50 23,2; Is. 1,42; Isocr. 10,60 12,218; Dem. 7,21 (14,16) 16,19 18,99 23,213 27,17.53 29,1 38,16 39,3 44,41 45,13 53,17; N. T. Acts, 4,37 25,25; in Her. 1,3; Thuc. 1,134.3, etc.; Plato, Symp. 174 D, etc.²

Sometimes the subject of a gen. abs. omitted in the abs. constr. itself appears in another case construction in the sentence, as in Lys. 1,38; Isocr. 9,29; Dem. 12,23 15,17 18,322 27,53 45,13 42,8 47,47: ἐμαρτύρησαν ἐθέλειν παραδιδόναι τὸν Θεόφημον τὴν ἄνθρωπον οὐδαμοῦ τὸ σῶμα παραδιδόντος, 51,56. With the gen., as in Isocr. 10,39, it is more doubtful whether the construction is absolute.

Several cases may be mentioned which have not been treated above. If the subject of a gen. abs., repeated or not, is found as subj. or object of a verb in a clause different from that of the verb in which the gen. abs. is found, it need not be considered, unless,

¹ In Her. 1,178, κέεται ἐν πεδίῳ μεγάλῳ μέγαθος ἐούσα μέτωπον ἕκαστον εἰκοσι καὶ ἑκατὸν σταδίων ἐούσης τετραγώνου, Abicht explains the gen. as depending on the idea τῆς μέτωπόν ἐστιν, which is conceived as having gone before. This is not impossible, but it would be just as easy to explain it as an example of the case before us.

² In Dem. 47,58, τῆς τίθης τὸ κυμβίον λαβούσης καὶ ἐνθεμένης . . . κατιδόντες αὐτὴν οὕτω διέθεσαν . . . αὐτὴν goes with both participle and verb, and hence does not belong here.

indeed, there is a close connection between the two clauses and the gen. abs. can be looked upon as depending equally well on both verbs; this is generally the case when the gen. abs. is in the principal clause, generally not when in the subordinate. Such are *e. g.* participial clauses: here the gen. abs. serves to bring out the right dependency, as in Dem. 40,13, γήμαντος δέ μου . . . ἐκεῖνος μὲν τὸ θυγάτριόν μοι ἐπιδὼν γενόμενον . . . ἐτελεύτησεν. Here the sense would be changed by reading γήμαντι: examples may be found in Lys., Isocr., Dem., Lyc. So too clauses with ὥστε, as Ant. 5,17, ἐθέλοντος γάρ μου οὕτως οὗτοι διεπράξαντο ὥστε τοῦτο μὴ ἐγγενέσθαι μοι ποιῆσαι. The same is true of oratio obliqua clauses as well. Strictly speaking the use of acc. and infinitive does not form a clause in Greek, but is simply a case of inf. depending on verb. In or. obl. we find *e. g.* Dem. 47,64, ἀπαιτοῦντος ἐμοῦ . . . οὐκ ἔφη ἀποδώσειν μοι. Here by reading the dative a change in dependence is made. With ὅτι, Dem. 50,47, κελεύσαντος δέ μου . . . λέγει ὅτι βούλοιτό μοι χάριν δοῦναι . . . Even in cases where the gen. abs. depends on an ordinary dependent infinitive the sense would be changed by changing the case, as Ant. 1,10, βασανιστὰς ἐκέλευον γίγνεσθαι ἐμοῦ παρόντος. If two gens. abs. are connected by a conjunction and the subject of one is also subject or object of a verb we need expect no other case, *e. g.* in Lys. 18,21, ὡς οὖν ἡμῶν ταύτην τὴν γνώμην ἔχόντων καὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων προγόνων τοιούτων γεγενημένων φείδεσθε ἡμῶν: or the gen. abs. may be connected with a participle in another construction and so render change unnecessary and impossible without completely altering the sentence, *e. g.* Isocr. 4,148, διαμαρτὼν δὲ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν συμμεινάντων . . . ἀπιούσιν αὐτοῖς συνέπεμψεν. Again, after a gen. abs. two verbs may occur and the subject of the gen. abs. be subject or object of one, as in Dem. 58,27, εἰ μὴ δεομένων αὐτῶν . . . ἐπίσθῃ ὑμεῖς καὶ πάλιν ἀπέδοτε αὐτοῖς . . . Here change would be unnecessary. Other cases need not be considered. The greatest freedom in this matter we observe in Demosthenes and Isocrates.

We now pass on to that use which Classen seems to regard as the original one, viz. without a noun expressed. The most important part of the construction is after all, as we have seen, the participle. The subject may be omitted if it can be made evident from the context; with the participle this is impossible, the action cannot be inferred, and if it is a real omission the gen. can no longer be absolute, but belongs to one of the other categories. Cases where one participle is used with several nouns,

or where a participle expressed in one clause is understood in another immediately following, as Lys. 25,31, *ἐκείνοι . . . ὀλιγαρχίας οὐσης . . . οὗτοι δὲ δημοκρατίας*, are no exceptions. In the few cases where there really seems to be an omission it can be accounted for. The words *ἐκόν* and *ἄκων* are used without *ᾧν*, probably to avoid the repetition of the syllable *ᾧν*; we find numerous examples: And. 1,9, *ἀκόντων τῶν οὐ βουλομένων*, 2,10; Lys. 8,5 12,63; Isocr. 15,307; Dem. 18,40 24,53; Aesch. 2,84, and so in other writers.¹ In cases where there is a real omission there ought to be something that will suggest the participle, as in Soph. Oed. Col. 83, *ὥς ἐμοῦ μόνης πέλας*, where the adverb suggests the participle, so in Oed. C. 1588, *ὑφηγητῆρος = ὑφηγουμένου*. The word *σύνκλητος* was felt as the equivalent of a participle in the expression *συνκλήτου ἐκκλησίας*. In Dem. 18,37-73 we have the words added *ὑπὸ στρατηγῶν*, this plainly shows the feeling.

In almost all the cases we can satisfactorily explain the omission of the participle; in the few that remain inexplicable, especially Xen. An. 7,8.11, the participle is to be supplied. On the other hand the subject of a gen. abs. can be and is quite often omitted. This is done when the subject is general, as people, things, etc., just as we say *λέγουσι*, or when it is an action that is specifically regarded as belonging to the omitted subject, as we say *ἐσήμνηε*, and secondly, and by far more frequently, when the subject has been mentioned in what precedes and so is present to the mind. Of the former we notice Ant. 5,44; And. 4,3: *ἐν τῷδε τῷ καιρῷ οὔτε κατηγορίας γενομένης οὔτε ἀπολογίας δοθείσης διαψηφισαμένων κρύβδην τοσοῦτον χρόνον δεῖ στερηθῆναι κτέ*, where we readily understand as subject those who regularly did the voting, *i. e.* the people; Lys. 13,82; Is. 10,9; Dem. 18,322 (*i. e.* with reference to the Mac. faction) 19,252 21,13 45,62; Aesch. 1,35 (in a law); Aristoph. Eq. 298: *βλεπόντων*, Vesp. 774: *ὄντος*. Here belong the neuter impersonal uses, as *εἰρημένου*, which will be treated later. The indefinite idea

¹ In the case Thuc. 3,82.1: *καὶ ἐν τῇ εἰρήνῃ οὐκ ἂν ἐχόντων πρόφασιν οὐδ' ἐτοίμων παρακαλεῖν . . .* Krüger wants *όντων* put in the text, and Classen says it is a very unusual omission of the participle and that *οὐκ ἂν ἐχόντων* is subordinate to *οὐδ' ἐτοίμων*. That the word *όντων* is omitted is true, just as he might have said *οὐκ ἂν ἐχοντες οὐδ' ἐτοίμοι* and omit *όντες*, but I should explain this gen. as I would such a nom., not as absolute, but as the omission of a participle which agrees with the principal subject, not itself a new absolute clause. Why Classen would subordinate *οὐκ ἂν ἐχόντων* (*οὐδ' ἂν εἶχον*) to *οὐδ' ἐτοίμων* (*οὐδ' εἰ ἐτοίμοι ἦσαν*) and not the reverse is not clear. The example in Xen. An. 7,8.11 is somewhat more difficult.

'things' is understood in Is. 8,30: *καὶ οὕτως ἐχόντων*, Dem. 24,12; Soph. Antig. 1179; Aesch. Ag. 1393. If the omitted subject do not fall under this head, it must have been mentioned or at least implied in the preceding. This occurs far more frequently than the former case. We find it Ant. 5,(45) (where we may regard the gen. as depending on *αἷμα*); And. 4,8,17; Lys. 1,38 2,(26).49 4,17 5,1 (6,26) 7,24 9,14 12,45.64 17,5.(7) 19,31.46 31,28; Is. (2,37) 6,(36).52 8,1.36 10,21; Isocr. (4,97) 9,29 (10,39) 12,(84).137. (264).(268) (15,87) (16,40); Dem. 4,2 9,5 10,38 12,23 15,12.17 18,288.(306).322 19,118.151.152.(298)309 21,93 23,(67)89.93.94.159 (24,80) (25,21) 27,53 29,14 30.16 (32,15) (33,33) 38,8.16 42,8 43.10 44,41.49 45,13.44 47,8.(34).47.51.56.71.77 (49,2) 55,23.26.30¹ (56,35) (59,7); Aesch. 2,(27).50. In the cases bracketed the word either may be as well regarded as depending on a noun, or the subject with another participle has occurred in the gen. abs., thus making it hardly a case of omitted subject. Where the examples are underlined, the subject itself not expressed in the gen. abs. occurs in the sentence in another case. These have been treated above. The same use is found in other writers of both prose and poetry. Aristophanes has some 13 cases, though he has not very many gen. abs. taken altogether. So the N. T. has a few examples: Matth. 17,14 (acc. to Cod. Vat.) 26; Acts, 21,10,31 25,17; Rom. 9,11. In this matter too Demosthenes leads, with Isocrates and Lysias next, the others using it rarely or not at all, as in the case of Dinarchus and Lycurgus.²

Post-Homeric is the use of the genitive absolute with *ὥς*. In Homer this particle is rarely used with any form of the participle, e. g. π 21, Τηλέμαχον . . . κύσειν ὥς . . . φηγόντα, and then not as it is used later. Probably the construction arose with the full force of *ὥς* as a particle of comparison; so we see it in the example just quoted. *ὥς κλέπτῃς ὡς ἀπήχθη* (Is. 4,28) then would have been felt originally as *ὥς κλέπτῃς ὡς ἂν ἀπήχθη* (or ἀπαχθείη) οὕτως ἀπήχθη. This was, however, gradually lost, and *ὥς* with a participle became the

¹ Sandys and Paley regard this as a case of neuter impersonal participle.

² The difficult passage, Plato, Rep. 436 D: οὐκ ἂν ἀποδεχοίμεθα ὥς οὐ κατὰ ταῦτ' αὐτῶν τὰ τοιαῦτα τότε μενόντων τε καὶ φερομένων ἀλλὰ . . . said of the movement of tops, etc., which are at the same time at rest and in motion, Stallbaum explains so as to make τὰ τοιαῦτα adverbial, and the gen. therefore abs. without subj. [Ast drops τὰ τοιαῦτα; but it may have slipped from its place after ἀποδεχοίμεθα. Cf. below: οὐδὲν τῶν τοιοῦτων λεγόμενον ἐκπλήξει.

B. L. G.]

expression for the view of the subject, be the view true or false. It is of course not conditional (cf. Gildersleeve, Justin M. I 4,8), for the negative is *οὐ*, and if we give a conditional rendering we put in an element not present in the Greek. With *ἄτε* and *οἷον* cause is emphasized, with *ὥς* not necessarily. In the orators the former do not occur with the gen. abs., *ὥς* quite often; with the present participle it is found: Lys. 2,60 12,2.14 (18,21) 31,28; Is. 3,3 (6,36); Isocr. 2,12 6,86 10,3.60 12,215 15,12.323 17,26 18,43 20,2; Dem. 7,33.44 (*ἄν*) 8,61 10,49 12,23 17,7.12.(28) 18,86.174.178 19,132.156(*ἄν*).156.304 21,8.76.127 23,89.177 25,44 27,20.62 28,17 32,7 33,30 35,18 46,9 47,77 48,46 (49,56) 50,24 53,10 55,20 59,97 61,22;¹ Aesch. 1,141 3,225; Din. 1,89.(95). With the perfect participle: Lys. 10,28 14,31 18,21 (26,10); Isocr. 12,89.264 15,12 18,43; Dem. 4,13 7,33 21,127 30,8 (38,8) 56,33.35 59,111; Lyc. in Leocr. §45; Din. 2,7. With the aorist participle: And. 1,29; Is. 6,52 7,3 8,1 11,28; Isocr. 12,153.153 15,100(*ἄν*).110; Dem. 18,168(*ἄν*).207 23,58(*ἄν*) 38,16.16 45,40 47,51(*ἄν*). With the future participle: And. 1,62; Lys. 14,10.10; Is. 7,15; Isocr. 6,100 15,100.149; Dem. 10,63 21,216 27,53, 30,28 32,7 61,22; Din. 2,22. Antiphon does not use the construction, Lycurgus but once. Demosthenes uses it most frequently. We see from the above lists that the present participle occurs thus with *ὥς* more frequently than all the others combined. This will in general be found to hold good everywhere in Greek prose, in some cases the disparity is greater; in Plato's Republic to a fair number of presents there occur two futures and no aorists. In the N. T. *ὥς* occurs in this way but five times: Acts, 27,30; 1 Pet. 4,12 pr.; 2 Pet. 1,3 pf.; 1 Cor. 4,18 pr. (*μή*); 2 Cor. 5,20 pr. In Aristoph. Av. 562 (pr.), 1513 pr.; Ran. 128 pr., (1118 pr.); Plut. 369 pf.

Not infrequently it happens that an imperative is used in the clause with *ὥς* and the gen. abs., e. g. Isocr. 15,149: *ὥς οὖν οὕτως αὐτῶν διατεθησομένων σκόπει*, 323: *φερέτω*. Just in the same way a verb of saying, as *λέγε*, may be used, as Arist. Aves, 1513: *ὥς ἀκούοντος λέγε*. Sometimes, Kühner says, we meet such examples where we should expect *εἴτε* or *ὥς* with a finite verb, and that it is used so with *εἰδέναι*, *ἐπίστασθαι*, etc. In so far as K. means by this that

¹ Sandys and Paley explain, Dem. 16,16: *ταῦτα δ' ἡμῶν λεγόντων . . . καὶ ἀξιούντων . . . μὴ κινεῖν . . . περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀντιλεγόμενων ὥς ἐτοίμων ὄντων κριθῆναι . . . ὥς ἐτοίμων ὄντων* as to be taken with *ἡμῶν λεγόντων*, thus it would be in the absolute case. Schaefer and Voemel take it with *τῶν ἀντιλεγόμενων*.

when a writer begins with such a verb we should expect him to express a certain idea, while in reality he expresses another, he is right; that he does mean this he shows by adding that here too *ὥς* is to be conceived as in every other case. When *ὥς* with gen. abs. follows such verbs they are used absolutely without object clause, *e. g.* Plato, Rep. 327 C: *ὥς τοίνυν μὴ ἀκουσομένων οὕτω διανοεῖσθε*, it is not 'think that we will not hear,' but make up your mind in the belief that, etc. The accusative with *ὥς*, Isocr. 5, 114: *λέγω δ' οὐχ ὥς δυνησόμενόν σε*, is to be taken as object of the verb. In Dem. 17, 28 we have *ὥς* with gen. abs. and no verb. Rehdantz says of this, in the index to his edition of Dem. 1-9: '*ὥς* bei dem Participium seltener nach Verbis des Sagens.' The words are: *ὑπομενοῦμεν . . . πολλὰς. οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἔστι γε εἰπεῖν ὥς Ἀθήνησι ἀφθόνων ὄντων τῶν ξύλων . . . ἀλλ' ὅσοντο . . .* If *ὥς* be taken with the participle in this sentence, the effect is the same as if any other verb had been used, but *ὥς* may be regarded as a conjunction introducing a subordinate clause with a verb (*ὑπομενοῦμεν*) understood.

With *ὥσπερ* the idea of comparison is still more prominent than with *ὥς*; it occurs less frequently than the latter in the orators and generally elsewhere. With the present participle we meet it: Lys. (2, 26) 24, 14 25, 31 26, 1 27, 11; Isocr. 4, 178 7, 1 12, 90 15, 89; Dem. 30, 36 42, 8. 14 51, 17 57, 65. With the perfect participle: Lys. 12, 64 25, 23 26, 1; Isocr. 7, 1 4, 178 10, 49 18, 46; Dem. 17, 21 19, 226 (*ὥσπερ ἀνεί*) 31, 12 35, 26 36, 17 42, 2 51, 17 54, 20 (*ὥσπερ ἀνεί*) 57, 65. With the future: Lys. 26, 1; Dem. 36, 17, and with the aorist, Isocr. 4, 178. With this participle, then, of the orators the gen. abs. is found only in Dem., Isocr. and Lysias. It does not occur in Aristophanes or in the N. T. *ἄτε* and *οἵα* do not occur in the orators with the genitive absolute, but in some authors, especially Plato, they are met with often enough, *e. g.* Plato, Rep. 350 D, 411 D, 458 C, 586 D; Symp. 223 C; Her. 1, 123. 171. 190; Thuc. 7, 85. 3. (24, 2 the MSS read *ὥσπερ*), etc.

Like *ὥσπερ*, we find only in Lys., Isocr. and Demosthenes the use of *ἄν* with the participle in this construction. This too is post-Homeric, and belongs to prose. It puts in the participial construction relations that other languages must express by subordinate clauses, thus losing much in conciseness and beauty. It is not used much. It occurs in the orators only in the following: Pres. partic., Dem. 7, 44 (*ὥς*) 18, 96 19, 156. 156 23, 189; aorist: Lys. 12, 78; Isocr. 15, 100 (*ὥς*); Dem. 9, 1 18, 168 23, 58 (*ὥς*) 30, 13 47, 51. All the examples except two are in Demosthenes, and most of

these in the great public speeches. In Dem. 40,10, καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐκ ἂν φάσκοιτος πεισθῆναι, the particle belongs to the infinitive, it precedes the present participle as it would have preceded the present indicative in the finite form.

By the side of this gen. abs. there is in Greek another absolute case used quite differently, viz. the accusative absolute; it is a later development which does not occur in Homer, and is essentially a prose construction, taken up to some extent in poetry as in tragedy and comedy in the trimeters, but not much, and is even limited in its use in prose. Whatever may have been the origin of its use, it is certain that its development was hastened by the necessity of having a distinction between a neuter impersonal participle and a masculine participle whose subject is omitted. These would have coincided in the genitive; the use of the accusative removes all difficulty. It is used in classic Attic prose as follows: 1st, and regularly with neuter impersonal participle, signifying possibility, necessity, obligation, etc., to which we might apply the term potential; these ordinarily have a concessive force. 2d, we see this extended to other neuter impersonal participles, but there is a feeling of doubt evinced by the use of the gen. side by side with the acc.; lastly (3) we observe the attempt made to set the acc. entirely on a level with the genitive. This experiment failed, it was limited to a few writers, Thucydides, Xenophon and Plato, from whom we must be ready to expect all manner of syntactical peculiarities. Thus we find Thuc. (4,125) saying κυρωθέν δ' οὐδέν for the regular genitive.

The neuter impersonal participles occurring in the orators are in the order of frequency of occurrence: ἐξόν (used almost as often as all the rest put together), δέον, προσήκον (τυχόν = adverb), παρόν, ὄν, προσταχθέν, μετόν, μέλον, μεταμέλον, γενόμενον (And. 1,81), διωρισμένον, δόξαν, μεταδόξαν, ἐκγεγόμενον, δεῖσαν, ἐξεσόμενον, ἐγγεγόμενον, προειρημένον. ὄν (which occurs quite often in Plato) is sometimes omitted, as in Dem. 4,10, ὡς πλευστέον; Isocr. 6,86. Of neuter impersonal participles belonging to class 2 we find a number in the genitive in the orators: Lys. 4,7, ἀδήλου ὄντος—Dem. 17,28, διειρημένου—23,169, ὄντος νομίμου—23,143 24,80, ἀδυνάτου ὄντος—35,52, γεγραμμένου—56,18, προδήλου ὄντος—50,17, εἰσαγγελθέντων—59,116; Aesch. 1,21.43.139, and in other writers; in Thuc. several times in the plural, as in 1,7.2 116,3 (cf. Dem. 50,17). In exactly similar instances we find the accusative, as Thuc. 1,125.2, δεδομένου—140,2 7,18.2 7,77.6 εἰρημένου = 5,30.1 = 5,39.3 7,44.4, ἀδύνατον ὄν. Of the third class

we find but few that must really be regarded as such, many of those given, *e. g.* by Kühner, II, p. 648, need not be considered absolute; so Her. 2,66: ταῦτα δὲ γέγονε πένθεα μεγάλα τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους καταλαμβάνει, 4,50: ἀντιτιθέμενα δὲ ταῦτα ἀντισήκωσις γίνεται, are called accusative absolute by him, but Abicht, who knows that there is something similar in the 7th book that cannot be called an accusative, says they are nominatives, and thus enriches the stock of absolute cases by one. The case in book 7 is in chapter 157: ἀλλῆς μὲν γὰρ γενομένη πᾶσα ἡ Ἑλλὰς χεὶρ μεγάλη συνάγεται, so 4,50. Why not make all these appositives? Abicht does this in 3,95: τὸ δὲ χρυσίον . . . λογιζόμενον . . . τὸ ψῆγμα εὐρίσκεται εἰς . . . Why not in the other cases?

With the genitive we have seen that the feeling may be that of an absolute case use even if the case can be otherwise explained, because there was a gen. abs., but with other cases we have no right to make such an assumption, indeed we have observed that if it was thought necessary to produce such feeling the gen. was used, though another case might have been expected according to the ordinary rules of syntax. Consequently we can explain cases like Isocr. 5,114; Soph. Oed. Col. 1119; Aristoph. Ach. 1182, etc., which seem to be accus. absolute, in some other way, generally as object of the verb. In the three authors mentioned, however, there is an unmistakable effort to place such accusatives absolute by the side of the genitive, an effort which never succeeded.

The acc. often occurs quite closely combined with the genitive absolute, as in And. 4,20; Lys. 7,43 18,5; Is. 3,46: ἄλλως τε καὶ μόνων τούτων τῶν δικῶν ἀκινδύνων οὐσῶν καὶ ἐξόν, 6,3; Isocr. 4,94.182 6,86 11,35 15,89 18,60; Dem. 3,27 19,304 (27,60) 50,22 51,17 56,18 58,17 59,27. Both abs. case constructions and the ordinary use of the participles are sometimes found connected, as in Lys. 18,5; Isocr. 4,93 6,86; Dem. 59,27.

From what has been said it will be seen that there is in the several orators a very great difference in the use of this construction, as well in frequency as in the manner of use. The early orators, Antiphon and Andocides, use it in a simple, easy way; no cases of *ὥς* or of *ἄν*, or of relative or interrogative pronoun as subject, etc. In the latter we find only one difficult use, viz. 4,20, where *ὥστε* with participle in the genitive follows a genitive absolute, but the speech is undoubtedly not genuine. In Lycurgus we find the same condition of things, and with but few exceptions in Lysias and Isaeus also. What a contrast the others, Isocrates, Demosthenes, Aeschines and Dinarchus, make to these! Above

all we notice in them the tendency to put together many genitives absolute. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in his treatise on Isaeus, in speaking of a certain passage in fr. XII of our collection, after criticising its opening takes up the words: *τριηραρχούντος γάρ μου ἐπὶ Κηφισοδότου ἄρχοντος καὶ λόγου ἀπαγγελθέντος ὡς ἄρα τετελευτηκὼς εἶην ἐν τῇ ναυμαχίᾳ, οὗσης μοι παρακαταθήκης παρ' Εὐμαθεὶ τούτῳ κτέ.* This he does not think at all simple, and shows how he would change it to make it less artificial, viz.: *ὅτε γὰρ ἐτριηράρχουν καὶ ἀπηγγέλη τοῖς ἐνθάδε ὡς ἄρα τ. ἐ. ἐν τ. ν. ἔχων μου π. Εὐμαθὺς οὐτοσί κτέ, ἰ. ε.* he changes the gen. abs. This is interesting, inasmuch as it shows that Dion. felt that it was more natural to write out the subordinate clause, but he can hardly mean that these are artificial or unnatural, for such examples can be gotten from the easiest authors, and even from Lysias with whom he is contrasting Isaeus. It would seem then that he has reference principally to the putting together of several genitives absolute in one sentence. In the works that we possess Lysias is as guilty of this proceeding as Isaeus, who only has 4,12³ 7,43³, while Lysias has 2,29³.38³.51 3,18³ 16,15³.16³ (the cases where only two are used have not been considered). In this respect, then, we can see but little difference between the two, indeed, ordinarily Isaeus is quite easy.¹ Antiphon has no example of this heaping up of many gen. abs.; Andoc. 1,51³.138³ 4,3³; Lycurgus, none; Isocr. 4,71³.93³.178³ 5,45³ 6,31³ 7,68³ 8,97³ 9,17³ 10,41³ 14,13³.41³ 15,100³ 16,16³.18³; Dem. 3,8³.27³ 18,45³.170³ 19,15³.50³ 21,13³ 23,104³ 24,9³.26³ 33,3³ 36,23³ 37,2³ 40,6³ 44,29³.61³ 45,3³.4³ 47,42³.51³ 49,13³ 50,17³.20³.22³.67³ 52,7³ 55,20³.23³ 58,26³ 59,3³.69³; Dinarchus, 1,1³.4³.10³.20³ (very involved).25³; Aeschines, 1,85³.108³ 2,13³.26³.79³.86³.138³.140³.176³ 3,117³.126³.129³.148³. Compare this with the other orators and the difference must at once be noticed. Cases like Aesch. 2,26 and 140 are probably unequalled by anything in Greek. In the historians it is rare indeed, even three together are something unusual, as *e. g.* Thuc. 1,9.2 7,27.4 we must look long for four, and some of the examples of the orators are altogether impossible. The same is true of the N. T., where one easy case occurs, Luke, 3,1, and it is never found in poetry.

An ornament of style sometimes made use of when two gen. abs. occur together is the chiasitic arrangement. Sometimes, no doubt,

¹ Not in one sentence but closely following one another we find a number of gen. abs. in Is. 5,16 sqq. 7,17 sqq. 44 8,25 8,38, in other orators we find such cases in Aesch. 2,76.122; Dem. 19,263 21,215 30,36 40,6 47,10.64 48,26 49,62 59,3.97; Isocr. 4,43.71 6,31.44.

this was naturally done, but in a large number of cases it is more probable that it was intentional. Examples are met with in all the orators, except Lycurgus, but in no one with great frequency; examples are: Ant. 4,8.3, ἄρξαντος δὲ τούτου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων κατηγορούντων—Lys. 16,16, χωρίων ἰσχυρῶν κατελειμμένων . . . Ἀγησιλάου δ' ἐμβαλόντος . . . ψηφισαμένων τῶν ἀρχόντων . . . φοβουμένων ἀπάντων; And. 2,11 3,20; Is. 1,4.12 5,7 6,12.29 8,27 11,23; Isocr. 3,33 4,42.(178) 6,31.(111) 7,68 9,14.56 10,(20).40.41 12,13 14,21.(27) 15,129 16,7.18.46 18,6.(11) 19,22.39; Dem. (1,18) 3,8 (7,33) 8,36 21,5.13.127.163 19,(50).152 23,172 33,3.19² 38,(6).7 41,14 44,37 45,12 47,34.45 50,4.55; Aesch. (1,180) 2,13 21.42.122.138.163 3,34.117.(125.126²).161; Din. 1,4.(20). Ant., Lys. and Din. use this but rarely.

Of the two ways of expressing the same general idea, gen. abs. and subordinate clause, the former as the briefer gradually appropriated certain recurring phrases, and under ordinary circumstances such expressions then adhered to it. This is true of all periods of the language. We find a number of them in the orators, *e. g.* χειμῶνος ὄντος, νυκτὸς, ἡμέρας γενομένης, etc. It will be of interest to consider the more prominent cases. Ordinarily when a Greek wished to say that a certain act took place while some one was living, he used the gen. abs. in expressing the latter clause, ζῶντος, etc. This we find everywhere from Homer on: Hom. A 48, π 438; in the orators, Ant. 2,6; Lys. 9,14; Dem. 18,72 40,13 42,27 44,55 55,3.15; Is. 2,27.37 6,11.26.36 8,8.44 11,12; Aesch. 1,14 3,219; Arist. Pax, 109; Eccl. 635. Sometimes we find the clause ἕως ἔζη or ὅτε ἔζη, as in Lys. 17,3. Again the word 'to die,' in subordinate temporal clauses is largely expressed by the gen. abs. The word used varies, ordinarily it is τελευτήσαντος, also ἀποθανόντος (always, as one might expect, in Antiphon), τεθνεώτος and τεθνηκότος. Examples are: Ant. 1,5 2,8.11 4,8.10 5,60; And. 3,20 4,13; Lys. 1,14 2,74 14,27 21,8 32,7.15; Is. 1,4.12.15 2,3 3,2.10 6,29.30.34.35 7,19 8,1 10,4 6,9; Aesch. 1,100 2,26 3,77.225. The same is true of Dem. and Isocr. and of the historians. The subordinate clause is not so much used unless it is necessary to bring out the proper relation clearly. Other expressions are: τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων (causal and concessive, if conditional it is generally written out, as Pl. Prot. 325 B; Dem. 4,29 16,15; Isocr. 15,218, etc., sometimes also if causal); it occurs, And. 2,13; Lys. 7,28 (19,11 ὑπαρχόντων); Isocr. 12,205 15,62.181; Dem. 5,3 18,250. 315 19,280 21,3 23,112 25,6 41,4 43,27 44,17.61 (55,8 ὑπαρχόντων) 57,3; Aesch. 3,5.149; but Dem. 14,37, ἐπειδὴ τοῦτ' οὐχ οὕτως ἔχει.

χρόνου διαγενομένου (διελθόντος), Lys. 1,15 (3,19, ἐτῶν παρεληλυθότων); Is. 2,10 11,9 pl.; Isocr. 10,41 15,169 (ἐγγ.) pl.; Dem. 5.5 (διελθ.) 23,153 (διελθ.) 27,63 36,26 (παρεληλ.) 45,4 (γυγνομ.) 47,30 (ἐγγεν.) 32 (ἐγγ.) 53,4 (προβαιν.) 55,26 59,3 (προελ.); Aesch. 3,221 (ἐγγ.) pl.; so Her. 1,8.28.73.190, etc.; Thuc. 1,82.2 113,1 126,8, like this: προῖόντος τοῦ χρόνου: Lys. 1,11; Is. 2,9; Dem. 39,14; Aesch. 1,63 3,58; (Thuc. 1,24.3 προελθ.); Pl. Phaedr. 255 A; (Ar. Nub. 1289 ὑπορρέοντος). προῖόντος τοῦ λόγου: Ant. 5,10; Isocr. 17,19; Dem. 33,3 44,5 50,31 59,20; Aesch. 1,2.42.82 (2,5 ἀπολογίας). Similarly we often find δεδωκότων—διδόντων τῶν νόμων (δόντων τ. ν., Is. 7,2), κελεύοντων τ. ν., οὐκ ἑόντων τ. ν., ἡμέρας γενομένης, χειμῶνος ὄντος (no less than five times in Aristophanes in five different plays in spite of the fact that Ar. does not use the construction, relatively speaking, very much), εἰρήνης οὔσης, γενομένης, δημοκρατίας οὔσης, all occurring quite often. In psephisms we have the fixed expressions φυλῆς πρυτανευούσης, and συγκλήτου ἐκκλησίας; in speaking of a law, forms like Μενίππου εἰπόντος, or γράψαντος or κελεύοντος, as And. 2,23; Isocr. 18,2; Dem. 23,172 38,23; Aesch. 3,108; Lyc. in Leocr. 113; Din. 1,39. Like ζῆν and τελευτᾶν, παρῆναι and θέλειν are very often put in the gen. abs. instead of using a subordinate clause, as in ἐμοῦ παρόντος, this is the usual form for ἕως παρὴν ἐγώ. In Homer too, in spite of the fact that there are so few gen. abs. altogether, we find repetitions in a number of instances, as ἐμου ἀπομνησίσαντος, I 426, T 62; περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν, B 551; περιτελλομένου ἔτεος, λ 295, ξ 294; περιπλομένου ἐνιαυτοῦ, λ 248; πολλῶν κατὰ οἶκον ἐόντων, δ 717, τ 195, ω 272. (κ 470, and ξ 163 = τ 307 are at least similar.) In the N. T. we often find ἔτι λαλοῦντος αὐτοῦ, ὁψίας γενομένης. All these cases are examples of the tendency in language to fix its expressions, and in any full treatment of the subject cannot be overlooked.

Reference has been made on several occasions to the popular use of this construction. In seeking to determine this we must bear in mind that anything which approaches complexity is avoided by the people; as long, therefore, as the gen. abs. remained a brief expression, giving the equivalent of a temporal subordinate clause, but expressed as part of the principal clause, it appealed to the popular sense, and in this way was no doubt used at all periods of the language. The later improvements, however, which made it gradually so complex, were never adopted by them, nor indeed is it likely that they used it in the simple cases very often. We have reason to believe that in most cases they resolved the expression into a subordinate clause. This opinion finds confirmation in those works which show us the language of conversation:

Aristophanes, Plato, especially his introductions, Lucian, etc. In none of these do we find many, and all are such as are spoken of above. Putting together many would be impossible for ordinary conversation, and if resorted to would have the effect of an imitation of the extravagances resorted to by the orators. How is it now that we find so many in some of the private orations, while the great public speeches show less? This is due in a measure to the requirements of narrative (see p. 320), narrative forming a large part of most of such speeches, but this does not explain all. There can be no doubt that when a private citizen had to appear before court, the rhetor who wrote the speech for him often tried to make him appear at his best, and so made him use expressions that, while not impossible, would not have been readily employed in ordinary conversation. This is but natural, and one of the easy ways of making a man appear somewhat unusual is to make him use many gen. abs. ; this is especially true when a bad speech-writer wrote such a speech. It is certainly a noteworthy fact that, except 55, all those private orations (not less than seven) which show percentages over 2.00 are spurious. In the case of 55 we must recognize a desire of imitating a higher style carried too far ; compare with it the speech praised even by the ancients as a model private speech, the 54th, and observe the great difference. Relatively there are but one-fourth as many in the latter, there are no cases of heaping together many : in 55 several ; in 54 no cases of participle without a noun, in 55 several ; so there are several cases of $\mu\eta$ with the participle in the latter, but none in the former. From all these facts we can but draw the conclusion already arrived at. Notice too how Dionys. Hal. changes the three genitives abs. in *Is. fr. XII*, saying that they are not natural.

In the great public speeches an inordinate use of the construction was avoided, unless the writer had a special object in view in using many, as making a climax, etc. In Lysias and Isocrates the greater number in the private speeches is largely to be explained by the fact that there is more occasion for its ordinary use. The fact that Aristophanes uses it but little may be due to some extent to the fact that his works are not prose, but had it been frequently used by the people we should certainly have had more. Present participles abound ; of all those in Aristophanes but six are aorists (one is doubtful) and six perfects, the rest, some 76, are presents. In narration many aorists occur, but even there the present very often predominates. With the people its use, no doubt, consisted to a

considerable extent of such standing expressions as were mentioned above, together with easy temporal expressions, as *γελῶντος δ' αὐτοῦ*, etc. Uses like *ἄν* etc., were not admitted, nor do they occur in the private orations. We find *ἄν* in Dem. 47, but the speech is spurious. This same simplicity we find later in the N. T.

As in the orators, so we find the use of this construction an important factor in the style of a writer in any sphere of literary activity. We have seen that the historians generally show fair percentages, while the philosophers have less, yet the simple, grand funeral oration of Pericles in Thuc. lib. II, though as long as some of the orations of the orators, has no example of this use. [Dem.] Epitaphios (60) has a small number, [Plato's] Menexenus many more, and [Lysias'] Epitaphios a very large number indeed. One cannot but feel the difference between Thucydides and pseudo-Lysias in this respect; while the former in his condensed pithy sentences avoids all necessity for its use, the other by introducing narrative finds abundant opportunity for it; but enough has been said of this.

Before closing this paper let us make a brief comparison between the Greek gen. abs. and the Latin ablative abs. In principle the same, they are widely different in use: hand in hand with the loss of the participle in Latin goes the lack of the varied and delicate use of this participial construction. Whatever may have been the origin of the Latin abl. abs., it started life with the same chances of development in certain directions that the Greek had, but with few changes it remained what it was throughout. What could the Roman do with the Greek abs. case in translating? And every one knows how largely their literature and language were influenced by translations. The utter absence of all participles for past time in the active and present time in the passive made it an absolute necessity (except where they had deponent verbs), unless the construction were changed, to change the voice and so change the nature of the thought. In Latin the temporal use is paramount to the others, *ὡς*, *ὥσπερ*, and *ἄν* are finesses of language for which the Latin had no equivalent, and if it be urged that *ἄν*, for instance, is found but rarely in Greek with the participle of a gen. abs., it is certainly a possibility which the great writers took care to make use of. In Greek, cases of the participle of the verb *εἶναι* make up about 10 per cent. of the occurrences, and with the compounds, as well as forms of *γίγνεσθαι*, the sum reaches about 20 per cent. In the absence of a participle to *sum*, the Latin

makes use of a number of abl. abs. in which the predication must be assumed, as in 'me iudice.' It is sometimes difficult to tell whether we have an abl. abs. or an abl. of manner, as in 'his testibus,' and distinctions of present and aorist as in *ὄντος* and *γενομένου* are lacking. Very common in Latin historical works are such short expressions as 'signo dato,' 'hostibus victis,' 'litteris missis,' 'tactis sacris,' 'stipendio imposito,' 'conserto proelio,' etc.; in Greek but few, the expression is made fuller and less jerky by the use of the article, a particle like *δέ*, *γάρ*, etc., or by some other word. Passive participles, which make up so large a percentage of the Latin use, do not occur frequently in Greek (see p. 323). Where the Latin uses such a passive the Greek would generally have used an active participle, making the subject of the abl. abs. object of the participle. On the other hand, most of the Greek gens. abs. would be resolved in Latin into subordinate clauses. If we examine the examples of the abl. abs. that occur frequently, we will find a very different set from that which was given above: *τούτων οὕτως ἔχόντων* becomes 'quae cum ita sint,' while 'his rebus gestis' is not often given by *τούτων πραχθέντων*, as Is. 2,28; Dem. 37,6 39,3; generally an active participle or a form of *γίγνεσθαι* is employed; *ζώντος τοῦ πατρός* is rendered not by 'patre vivente,' but 'patre vivo,' and more frequently resolved into a clause with 'dum'; the same is true of most of the other expressions. Like the Greek, the Latin at times used the abl. abs. where the same word was subject or object of the sentence, but careful writers avoided this use; authors like Plautus, who wrote naturally, have it, Cicero rarely; in Greek, if its use could add to the liveliness of the representation it was used by all kinds of prose writers, by Demosthenes as well as by Herodotus.

We have then, in this construction, another of the many evidences of what this gifted nation could make out of the linguistic material it possessed. With every chance for leaving it simple, unadorned, without anything to distinguish it from the similar uses of other languages, the Greeks developed it, making use of all that lay in their power, until it became a very important element in the build of a Greek sentence, a variant for a large number of subordinate sentences, simple or complex, possessed of the means of varying its signification in many ways by the particles mentioned, and unequalled by the absolute construction of any language of the Indo-European family.

EDWARD H. SPIEKER.

V.—TWO POINTS IN FRENCH STYLE.

To a much greater extent than either Englishmen or Germans the French have striven and still strive after a fine style. Instruction in Latin and Greek in the French schools is so directed as to be mainly a training in writing good French. The great effort of the teachers is, and has been for centuries, to develop a feeling for style, one of the forms of good taste, the favorite and dominant characteristic of the nation. I wish to draw attention to two changes in modern French prose which seem to be a result of a continuous endeavor to improve style.

The first requisite of a good prose style is that it should be clear, and accordingly perfect clearness is a common characteristic of French literature from Malherbe down. To reduce as much as possible the effort which the reader has to make has been a prime object among French prose writers for the last two hundred and fifty years. They very early gave up the striking inversions and the forcible compressions and audacities which add so much to the poetic value of the *Chanson de Roland*, mainly, it would seem, to gain in clearness of expression an essentially prosaic quality. Looking in the later language for phenomena growing out of a cultivation of this quality, it occurred to me that a gradual shortening of the length of sentences might be expected. The labor involved in following the current of thought in a long sentence is often considerable, and if the long sentences come close together, soon becomes very tiresome; the faculty of attention becomes strained, every now and then the sense is lost and you have to go back to the beginning of the sentence. Accordingly a gradual shortening of the length of sentences would be expected, and the evidence I have collected shows that such a shortening has actually taken place. As a rough means of obtaining the average length of one hundred consecutive sentences in any writer, I have estimated the average number of verbs in each sentence, on the theory that the ratio between the average number of words and the average number of verbs in one hundred consecutive French sentences will be nearly constant, so that the number of verbs and the number of words will vary proportionately, and one may be taken as the

index of the other. As far as I have tested this theory it is borne out by the facts. In various writers, from Montaigne down to modern times, the ratio between the number of words and the number of verbs in a sentence varies in different sentences from 4:1 to 15:1; but the average ratio of a sufficiently large number of sentences is invariably between 6:1 and 7:1.

Taking then one hundred consecutive sentences in Montaigne, I found an average of 6.02 verbs for a mean Montaigne sentence. Taking in Fénelon, who comes about a century later, one hundred consecutive sentences in the same way, the mean Fénelon sentence was found to contain 4.48 verbs, making a drop of 1.54. Voltaire, who may be taken to represent the 18th century, yields an average of 3.89, or 0.59 less than Fénelon, and he is the first writer whose crisp sentences have the ring of modern French. Finally, coming to contemporaneous French, Sainte-Beuve yields an average sentence with 3.95 verbs, and Alphonse Daudet one with 3.38 verbs, a drop from Fénelon of 0.53 and 1.10 respectively. Of course these figures should be confirmed by subjecting more authors to the same tests, but as a provisional result it is interesting.

Improvement in clearness through shortening of the sentence is, however, a characteristic which cannot be claimed as exclusively French. The same thing has certainly occurred in English, as may be seen by comparing Milton and Cromwell's prose with that of any modern writer. But there is another trait of modern French prose style which is more peculiar to it. This is the aim of many French writers to keep the fancy of the reader in a constant state of agreeable exercise. This tendency shows itself in the artful carelessness of the arrangement, and in the occasional appearance of startling yet appropriate images; but it also appears, especially in more modern writers, in the use made of a large class of attributive adjectives. Most adjectives in French follow the noun, a few always precede it; but a large class of adjectives denoting, most of them, what are called moral characteristics, may come either before or after the noun as the writer pleases. He may place one of these adjectives before or after the noun either from mere accident, or because he thinks it sounds better, or finally because he thinks that one order of succession rather than the other will produce just the effect he is striving after. If there is nothing but accident in the matter, the chances will be that analogy will unconsciously make him place the adjective after its noun; if it is put first it will either be for euphony or for some other definite

reason. In prose of the classic period the guiding motive where preposition occurs is very often euphony. I have collected all the cases that occur in Bossuet's funeral oration at the burial of Henriette d'Angleterre. Bossuet is very fond of pouring forth a sonorous flood of epithets; but his only motive in determining their position seems to be to round off his periods as harmoniously as possible. 'Prédestination éternelle' stands near 'éternelle prédestination,' 'la véritable vie' near 'les biens véritables,' 'la naturelle situation' near 'la mutabilité naturelle,' 'saints conseils' near 'vérités saintes,' with no discoverable reason except euphony for using one order rather than the other. But in the writing of his more attractive rival, Fénelon, we can see already a different motive appear, which can be traced with increasing frequency in some modern writers. To show what this motive is, it will be best to look into the mental process we go through when in reading we come upon a noun and an attributive adjective. Mr. Herbert Spencer, in his *Essay on the Philosophy of Style*, contrasting the English preposition with the French postposition of the adjective, prefers the English usage on the ground that it requires no rearrangement of the idea conveyed by the noun to suit the modification of that idea introduced by the adjective. When, he says, we hear the expression—a horse black—we first picture to ourselves on hearing the noun a brown image, brown horses being the commonest, and this image we have to correct to suit the subsequent black, while in the English order we first call up blackness, and in this blackness cut out our horse. He concludes then that, on the great principle of economizing the reader's attention as much as possible, the English usage is far preferable. This seems plausible enough, but proceeds, as it seems to me, on a radically false view of what takes place in the mind. It supposes a definiteness in the images called up which is very far from existing. In ordinary reading, or in listening to rapid speaking, where abstract and concrete, generic and specific names follow close on each other, what comes before the mind of a grown-up man when a generic term such as horse without an adjective is read or heard, is rather a sense that he knows all about the thing meant and that he can, if necessary, call up an image of it than an actual clear-cut image of a particular brown horse, or of an ideal brown horse unconsciously evolved by the mind; and unless the horse plays an important part in what follows, the sense of ability to call up an image if wanted is all that need come into play. If then a

distinguishing epithet such as black be added, the animal springs at once before the mind, without the expenditure of the slightest amount of unnecessary attention. In writing which appeals solely to the reasoning powers the less attention devoted to sensual images the better, and surely less attention to a sensual image is called for when we hear 'a horse black,' than when we hear the black first, and conjure up in our minds an indefinite amount of darkness out of which the horse is then cut. For purely intellectual writing then, it seems that the French usage of postposition is the best, and there is this great additional advantage, that the writer wishing to appeal to the fancy of his readers can do so very effectively by putting the adjective out of its usual place. The placing before the noun of an adjective which he has usually seen after it calls up an exceptionally strong image of the quality designated before a modern Frenchman's mind; a veil, as it were, sometimes bright, sometimes mysterious, is thrown over the following noun, and the fancy is exercised very much in the same way as when listening to the fantastic embroidery of appoggiaturas which in Chopin's music so often precedes the most telling note of the melody. Of course this is a thing which is more easily felt than expressed or proved; but a few examples will perhaps make it plainer. Out of thirty different adjectives of the class we are considering placed before their nouns in as many octavo pages of the *Télémaque*, there are perhaps half a dozen where this exciting of the fancy rather than euphony seems to be the determining motive of the preposition. Thus, contrary to the general use of the language in prose, which is to put color epithets after the noun, he tells us of 'de jaunes épis,' 'une noire tempête,' 'le noir Tartare,' making the yellowness of the corn and the blackness of the tempest and of Tartarus much more vivid and pervasive. Of course the transition from a purely euphonic preposition of the adjective to its preposition for the purpose of producing a fantastic lingering over the epithet is very gradual. In many cases euphony seems to be the main determining motive, with, however, the merest additional touch of something else. The more unusual it is for a certain adjective to be before a certain noun, the more forcible will be the effect produced when it is put before that noun, and the more likely it is to have been put there mainly to increase the emotional effect, and not for euphony.

In the *Confessions* of Rousseau I have collected thirty-five cases of preposition in ten quarto pages. Among them there is one, 'ce

misérable honneur,' where the preposition adds very much to the vigor of the expression, and several such as 'une voluptueuse langueur,' and 'ma charmante maîtresse,' where a certain dwelling on the epithet is evidently intended.

Chateaubriand, who employs preposition more sparingly than the older writers I have mentioned, does it with far more boldness, discrimination and effect. In an amount of the *Génie du Christianisme* equal to that taken from Rousseau and Fénelon I found only twenty-three cases of preposition; but of these eight were striking instances of poetic effect. Thus: 'qu'il était étonnant d'oser trouver des conformités entre nos jours mortels et l'éternelle existence du maître du monde;' 'de croulants portiques,' 'leurs innombrables jours.' But his use of 'sacré' is his boldest and perhaps most effective case of preposition. As a rule in prose sacré means sacred only when it follows the noun; and in rather trivial style it is put before the noun in the sense of accursed. Chateaubriand, by prepositing it in particularly solemn passages, throws a kind of awful glamour over the following noun which nothing else could give: 'Sacrés débris des monuments chrétiens, vous ne rappelez point des injustices et des violences.'

In La Bruyère, who does not at all appeal to the imagination, preposition is infrequent, and euphony seems to be the only motive.

In Alphonse Daudet, out of twenty cases of preposition seven seemed to have a distinctly imaginative or emotional ground.

Finally, in that extremely sober and chastened writer, Prosper Mérimée, I found only fifteen cases of preposition in thirty pages; but thirteen of these have just enough glow about them to titillate the reader's fancy agreeably and raise a little ripple in the smooth current of the story.

Thus a desire to excite the reader's fancy agreeably, combined with the influence of analogy, seems to be working in two directions. On the one hand there is a tendency to use preposition less and less, on the other hand it is used less frequently for euphony and more frequently to excite the fancy. A liberty which was formerly made use of for euphony alone, has been taken advantage of for a much higher purpose, and we have here an instance of how the persistent cultivation of style is tending to make the language a more and more delicate instrument.

P. B. MARCOU.

NOTES.

ON THE POSTPOSITIVE *et* IN PROPERTIUS.

The text of the Elegies of Propertius as adopted by Müller and printed at Leipsic by Teubner in 1874, gives the following results when examined with reference to the postpositive use of the conjunction *et*. A casual reading of the text forced upon the writer's notice the frequency of this use, and the cases of it are classified here for purposes of reference.

126 cases of this use of *et* were discovered, not including I 8 : 6, which is classed as doubtful and dismissed herewith. In no case is the conjunction postponed more than three places, and but two instances of this occur, I 13 : 32 and III 13 : 11.

The *et* is postponed two places in twenty instances, viz : I 4 : 15, 16 : 29, 16 : 30 ; II 6 : 12, 7 : 20 ; III 1 : 6, 7 : 38, 11 : 12, 15 : 19, 20 : 48, 26 : 16, 30 : 49 ; IV 6 : 36, 9 : 27, 10 : 59, 14 : 46, 17 : 3, 21 : 15 ; V 10 : 19, 11 : 74.

The remaining postpositions are 104 in number and of one place only. They are found in

I 1 : 12, 1 : 32, 2 : 11, 3 : 3, 3 : 42, 6 : 22, 9 : 31, 13 : 6, 15 : 20, 15 : 30, 16 : 12, 16 : 22, 16 : 32, 17 : 20, 17 : 22, 18 : 22, 19 : 12, 19 : 23, 20 : 28.

II 2 : 9, 3 : 44 (two cases), 4 : 16, 8 : 19, 8 : 20, 8 : 32, 9 : 7, 9 : 22.

III 3 : 6, 4 : 4, 4 : 12, 7 : 28, 7 : 34, 8 : 30, 9 : 14, 10 : 14, 11 : 2, 12 : 15, 15 : 42, 17 : 10, 17 : 14, 18 : 8, 19 : 7, 20 : 7, 20 : 12, 20 : 17, 22 : 51, 22 : 56 (two cases), 23 : 3, 23 : 7, 23 : 14, 24 : 4, 24 : 28, 27 : 27, 28 : 21, 31 : 40, 32 : 7, 32 : 8, 32 : 37, 32 : 44, 32 : 46, 32 : 56, 32 : 62, 32 : 70.

IV 2 : 12, 4 : 24, 4 : 34, 4 : 38, 5 : 18, 7 : 2, 8 : 33, 8 : 53, 9 : 30, 10 : 26, 10 : 44, 11 : 2, 11 : 28, 12 : 8, 13 : 6, 17 : 10, 21 : 13, 23 : 10.

V 1 : 24, 1 : 46, 1 : 132, 3 : 10, 3 : 25, 3 : 32, 3 : 37, 3 : 38, 3 : 41, 3 : 55, 5 : 28, 7 : 26, 7 : 45, 7 : 90, 8 : 41, 8 : 60, 8 : 85, 9 : 26, 9 : 29, 9 : 49, 11 : 25, 11 : 101.

In the instances where *et* follows three words, the preceding words are in the one case a pronoun, verb, and adjective ; in the other, a preposition and two personal pronouns.

In the instances where *et* follows two words, the preceding words are as follows: verb and conjunction, two cases; pronoun and noun, four cases; pronoun and verb, two cases; two adverbs, two cases; noun and adjective, three cases; pronoun and conjunction, one case; adjective and verb, one case; pronoun and adverb, one case; preposition and adjective, one case; verb and noun, two cases; two nouns, one case. The case where two adverbs precede is almost equivalent to a postponement of but one place, as the two adverbs preceding it are *quo magis*, whose connection both in syntax and in sense would almost warrant their being written here as one word. Cf. *idcirco*, *quare* and others.

In the 104 cases of single postposition we find the preceding words can be classed thus: verb, 48 times; adjective, 24 times; noun, 23 times; adverb, 8 times; pronoun, once. These cases are in the 4028 lines that constitute the 99 elegies according to Müller's arrangement.

It is not amiss to add that Propertius is also fond of a species of rhetorical repetition which is almost Ciceronian in character.

NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Marlowes Werke, historisch-kritische Ausgabe, von HERMANN BREYMANN und ALBRECHT WAGNER. I. Tamburlaine, hrsg. v. A. WAGNER. Heilbronn, Henninger, 1885. [Englische Sprach- und Literaturdenkmale des 16, 17 und 18 Jahrhunderts, hrsg. von Karl Vollmöller. No. 2.]

"Comparison," says Prof. Minto, "is the soul of criticism." Without pressing the validity of this generalization, we may at least appeal to its suggestiveness. A comparison with the previous editions of the Tamburlaine, such as the present editor's introduction practically supplies in a critical bibliography of the play, most effectively makes clear the characteristics of the volume before us. We shall therefore do well in presenting a summary of a portion of this more than usually interesting introduction.

Prof. Wagner is the first editor to have thoroughly studied the old copies of this play, and by critical tests to have determined, as we think, their true relation to each other. The conclusion arrived at in this investigation is as follows: The play is preserved to us in three old editions: A, London, 1590, octavo; B, London, 1592, octavo; C, London, 1605-6, quarto. Langbaine's quarto of 1593 is, in all probability, a figment due to a stroke of the pen which, on the title-page of the only known copy of B, has given the numeral 2 the appearance of a 3. The fragment of a quarto of 1590, preserved at Bridgewater House, and reported by Hazlitt and Dyce, containing the title-page and the address to the reader, is found to agree line for line and letter for letter with A; and so the non-existence of a quarto of 1590 is put beyond a doubt. As to the interrelation of the old copies, the editor has shown that B, issued by the same printer, is a reprint of A, differing from it by an addition of new errors, and a correction of some of the previous misprints. In no instance does C agree in those errors which distinguish B from A; but it does agree in the errors of A, from which it is therefore to be derived. It may be noted that C comes off with the largest share of errors. Complete lists of these several classes of errors are an important feature of the editor's introduction.

With this view of the sources of the text, we may pass in review the editions that have since appeared. The first of these, after a lapse of more than two hundred years, is found in the anonymous Pickering edition of Marlowe's Works (1826). This edition is notoriously untrustworthy, as is also that in Oxberry's Theatre (1818-1829), which appeared about the same time. We are thus brought to Dyce's edition (1850) which has so long held the field. Dyce did good service in exploring, in the face of difficulties, incidents relating to the life and authorship of Marlowe, and his text of the Tamburlaine is based on the first independent study of the old editions. He, however, committed the fundamental error of ignoring A. Upon too slight evidence, and without autopsy, he presumed A and B to be "the same impression, differing only in

the title-pages." As a natural consequence of this view he was driven to derive C from B, and, therefore, in cases of difference, to give uniform preference to B, and so to undervalue and exclude older and better readings of A which are perpetuated in C. Cunningham's edition (1870) is a step in the wrong direction. The editor is in hopeless confusion as to the old editions, none of which, as is clear, he ever consulted, and depends entirely upon Dyce for the text, which greatly degenerates under his treatment. While Prof. Wagner's edition was going through the press there appeared the last complete edition of *The Works of Marlowe*, edited by A. H. Bullen, B. A., London, 1885. The *Tamburlaine* of this edition, while an advance upon Dyce's, in the opinion of Prof. Wagner, is still wanting in the right employment of A. The editor has had B and C before him in the preparation of his text, and by correspondence has consulted A "on certain corrupt passages," finding it more convenient to adopt Dyce's opinion of A than to visit Oxford for a personal examination of it. It should be remembered that it was the avoidance of this same inconvenience that led Dyce to quiet his philological conscience by the assumption of identity, which he no doubt tried to believe in.

The uniqueness of the present volume is apparent. We now for the first time have a text based upon the oldest copy, A, accompanied by the variant readings so "dass sich jeder die drei alten Ausgaben bis auf den Buchstaben getreu rekonstruieren kann." The spelling, moreover, is not modernized. The editor is aware of the important bearing of this question of orthography on the study of English authors, and announces his doctrine with point and enthusiasm: "Noch heute glaubt man ziemlich allgemein, dass es sich bei diesen modernisierungen lediglich um graphische änderungen handle. Aber das ist nicht der fall. Ein blick in Abbotts Shakespearian Grammar dürfte jeden überzeugen, wie verschieden die sprache des 16 jahrhunderts in grammatischer und stilistischer hinsicht von der modernen war, und so kommen zugleich mit der orthographie eine unmasse von besonderheiten der grammatik und des stiles in betracht, die von den modernisatoren unbarmherzig unterdrückt werden. Man sucht die altertümlichen formen und konstruktionen zu vermeiden und den stil so viel als möglich zu glätten und dem geschmacke des modernen lesers anzupassen. Dass es dabei ohne grosse inkonsequenz nicht abgeht, ist ein weiterer übelstand: die zustutzung tritt nur da ein, wo sie ohne schwerere änderungen möglich ist. So kommt es, dass in diesen ausgaben altertümliches und modernes in buntem, zufälligem gemisch nebeneinandersteht. Im grossen und ganzen dürfen wir sagen: die modernisierten texte rufen ein falsches bild hervor, sie bieten einen zustand der sprache dar, wie er tatsächlich weder im 16 jahrhundert noch sonst existiert hat, und sie wirken insofern direct schädlich, als sie den eindruck hervorrufen, man habe hier wirklich die werke Shakespeares und seiner zeitgenossen und vorgänger unverfälscht vor sich."

That a lesson so plain should ever have been lost sight of, comports with the general development of knowledge. A middle period of excess in theory, in which facts are often treated in violent disproportion, not seldom precedes the calm return to first principles—the closing of the circle which begins and ends in intuition. Erudition for awhile would seem to look too high, and, refusing "to have peace with wit," or "truce with sense," to become

blinded to plain truth that lies at her feet. A host of learned critics of Shakespeare, for example, might have saved much of their labor, and so blessed the world, had they reflected upon the simple law in language, that the forms of one period cannot be superposed upon the rhythm and idiom of another. Familiarity with old glossaries of detached words could not save the author of the Rowley poems from detection by the direct intuition of his unschooled sister, who, after listening to one of her brother's poems, exclaimed, "Your style is easily to be discovered in it."

In illustration of grammatical peculiarities which a return to the old copies restores to us, we may notice verbal plurals in *s*, such as "*hangs*" (314); "*saies*" (768); "*thinks*" (918), etc.; and the parti-colored vocabulary of a modernized text attaining to the grotesque may be observed in the retention of forms like "*renommed*"; "*ysprong*" (1202), "*ymounted*" (4096). But a thorough-going editor knows no bounds: in the edition of 1826 we have "*ere sprung*" and "*mounted*," falsifying the text in the one case, and destroying the measure in the other.

The old spelling often makes clear the metrical value of a word which its modern form tends to obscure, *e. g.*:

- l. 497. "In happy *hower* we haue set the Crowne"
- ll. 2205-6. "Ah, that the deadly panges I suffer now
Would lend an *howers* license to my tongue."
- l. 1516. "That should be horsed on *fower* mightie kings"

Confirmation, if needed, is thus gained for verses such as:

- l. 812. "And prest out *fire* from their burning iawes"
- l. 651. "And kill as *sure* as it swiftly flies"
- l. 652. "Thy words *assure* me of kind successe"

Again the following:

- l. 204. "To safe conduct vs *thorow* Affrica"
- l. 648. "That ere made passage *thorow* Persean Armes"

In this connection it is interesting to observe that, *through* and *thorough* not yet being differentiated in meaning, the poet, according to the requirements of the verse, has a choice of forms:

- l. 4101. "At euery litle breath that *thorow* heauen is blowen"
- l. 4104. "And drawen with princely Eagles *through* the path"

The results of a preliminary study of the sources of Marlowe's Tamburlaine, first made public over the joint signature of the editor and Mr. C. H. Herford, in the Academy of Oct. 20, 1883, are incorporated in the introduction. These sources are also added in their original form. With Fortescue's translation of the Tamburlaine chapter from the Spanish original of Mexia, and the necessary excerpts from the version of Perondinus, the means are at hand for an exact study of the dramatist's art in the composition of this play.

The notes appended to the volume are founded upon the work of previous editors, especially Dyce, and are elaborated in a way helpful for elemen-

tary purposes, by citations from other authors, and the free use of Nares' Glossary, Schmidt's Shak. Lex. and Abbott's Shak. Gram. In notes that are concerned in questions of metre the editor gives evidence of a rational method, so that we may look forward with some expectation to the full treatment of Marlowe's versification which is promised with the close of this newly-begun edition of his works. In the meantime the student will do well to study the Tamburlaine, in all probability the first English drama written in blank verse for public presentation.

JAMES W. BRIGHT.

First Middle English Primer. Extracts from the Ancren Riwe and Ormulum, with Grammar and Glossary. By HENRY SWEET, M. A. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1884.

This little book of less than a hundred pages consists of 18 pages of Grammar of the Southern dialect as seen in the Ancren Riwe, 23 of text, 4 pages of Grammar of the East Midland dialect as seen in the Ormulum, 32 of text, and 18 of Glossary for both. Mr. Sweet states his purpose in the Preface "not to afford a general survey of the M. E. dialects in their different periods, but rather to lay a firm foundation for such a survey by giving extracts from the two oldest texts which have been handed down in consistent contemporary spellings representing pure and fixed dialects, one dialect being the direct descendant of the classical West Saxon of Alfred and Aelfric, the other the nearly direct ancestor of Modern English."

This is a laudable purpose, and if it can be accomplished in this way, Mr. Sweet's excellent Primer will go far to accomplish it, but he himself evidently has some doubt about it, for he says: "Although I think it a great mistake to begin the study of M. E. without a previous elementary knowledge of Old E., such as may easily be acquired with the help of my *Anglo-Saxon Primer*, I have, nevertheless, adapted this work to the requirements of those who may take it up without any such preparation." If there are any who are so unfortunate as not to have the means of studying Anglo-Saxon, or Old English, and still wish to attempt Middle English, they might well begin with this Primer, but after a pretty extensive experience in teaching both Anglo-Saxon and Early English, I would merely say "don't." I should go further than Mr. Sweet, and not only "think it a great mistake," but utterly useless to study English of the *thirteenth* century without some previous knowledge of Anglo-Saxon. It is building without a foundation, and the student will be puzzled at every turn. Questions will arise for which he can find no solution in the English of that period, and *a fortiori* of a later period, so that he will be compelled to start at the beginning. Moreover, I say it with diffidence, after three years' trial I do not think Mr. Sweet's A. S. Primer well fitted to give such an elementary knowledge. There is not enough of it, though it is good enough as far as it goes. I find that students, even after mastering it thoroughly, have not acquired that grasp of the A. S. grammar, and especially that knowledge of the vocabulary, which they ought to have in order to make their subsequent studies in Middle English plain sailing. I think it probable also that the same objection may be brought against this M. E. Primer. I

doubt if there is enough of it for practice, though after acquiring an elementary knowledge of Old English (Anglo-Saxon) the student will not need extensive extracts from particular Middle English works. Mr. Sweet is, however, right in limiting the field of M. E. dialects, but we cannot multiply text-books in teaching, and it seems to me that what we need for this whole period down to Chaucer, is some *one* good book with sufficient extracts from each of the *main* dialects, Northern, Midland, and Southern, and corresponding grammatical introductions and glossary, to enable the student to take in the phonetic and inflexional characteristics of each portion of Middle English literature, so that he may comprehend how each contributed to the formation of Modern English. Such a book might be made out of the two parts of Morris and Skeat's Specimens by cutting them down one-half, omitting the least important, and, if need be, extending the most important extracts, and re-writing the grammatical introduction and glossary. This book, along with Mr. Sweet's Reader, revised on the lines of Sievers's Grammar, or used along with that work—as Professor Cook has just given us an excellent translation of it—would furnish all the apparatus needed for collegiate instruction in English before Chaucer. This must come, for English, and English taught historically, is the study of the future, and the sooner it comes, the better for the present generation of Englishmen and Americans. With such aids to thorough instruction, teachers of English need not fear comparison with the philological and scientific study of any language whatever.

I have left but little space to speak of Mr. Sweet's Primer. He has for the first time marked the quantity of M. E. vowels, and has taught us that "short vowels were lengthened before *ld, ng, nd, mb, rd*, and in other more doubtful cases" (p. 6). He uses the characters *ē* and *ē̄* for a different purpose from that stated in his A. S. Reader and Primer, *ē* and *ē̄* being used to denote the vowels derived from A. S. *æ* and *ǣ*, the latter being also written *ea*, but A. S. *ǣ* is sometimes represented by *ē̄*, and the distinction is not sufficiently explained; cf. *lēden*, lead, and *lēten*, let (p. 16). *ē̄* is not used, and *ē̄̄* is used to represent the vowel derived from A. S. *ā*, which is also written *oa*. This use of characters already appropriated is unfortunate. The remarks on the monophthongic character of the old diphthongs *ea, ēa, eo, ēo*, do not seem full and clear enough. Mr. Sweet finds *s, p, and f* voiced initially and finally (p. 3) in the Ancræn Riwle, but voiceless initially (p. 44) in the Ormulum. He holds to the old view that Orm doubles his consonants "to show shortness of the preceding vowel," but on this subject cf. Trautmann in Anglia, VII, Anzeiger, p. 94 ff., and Effer, Anzeiger, p. 166 ff. (see the Report of Anglia in this number).

The declensions and conjugations follow the arrangement in Sweet's A. S. Reader, which is inferior to that of Sievers. The grammar of the Ormulum is very meagre. The list of errata may be increased by the following: p. 10, l. 6, for *hōt* read *hōt*; p. 12, l. 8, for *ōn* read *ōn*; p. 15, l. 20, for *hērdē* read *hērdē*; p. 16, l. 21, for *luvedes* read *luvedest*, l. 23, for *luvede* read *luveden*; and p. 17, l. 18, for *wōt* read *wōt*.

J. M. GARNETT.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Academica. The text revised and explained by JAMES S. REID, M. L. London, Macmillan & Co., 1885. 371 pp.

In 1874 Mr. Reid published a small edition of the Academica, now out of print, which was well received in England and Germany, and showed a decided

advance in the treatment of this most important work. Previous to that time the latest explanatory edition of the *Academica* in Germany had been the much overrated one of Goerenz (1810), while in England none had appeared since that of Davies (1725), which was very scholarly. The present edition, as Mr. Reid tells us, is not "a revision of the earlier, but a new work, written on a larger scale, from a fresh and extended study of the text, language and subject-matter of the treatise." This claim is well sustained by the contents of the book. The critical notes, written in Latin, are entirely new, eight MSS of the *Academica Posteriora* and three of the *Lucullus* having been collated by Mr. Reid himself. The commentary is very fresh and vigorous, and displays a minute acquaintance with Ciceronian usage such as is rarely met with, the statements made being backed up by a multitude of examples which leave little to be desired. Often Mr. Reid corrects the generalizations and misstatements of Draeger, attacks the rules laid down by the grammarians, and shows new meanings for words which the lexica do not recognize. He has also been at the pains to study at first hand the Greek authorities for the period of philosophy with which the work deals, and is thus enabled to make sense out of passages which have been stumbling-blocks to previous editors. Great attention has been paid to the orthography, as every one would expect who is acquainted with the school editions of Mr. Reid, which in this respect so much surpass most of the English school editions. A good specimen of Mr. Reid's microscopic accuracy will be found in the note on II 11, 34, where the reasons for reading *atque* instead of *ac* before *comprendi* are fully stated, and the use of *ac* before gutturals and vowels is closely examined not only in Cicero but in other writers.

The introduction contains much that is interesting to students, and some views which are decidedly new. §1 discusses Cicero's study of philosophy, proving that his attainments were not those of a mere dabbler. §2 treats of the philosophical opinions of Cicero, his relations to the new Academy and the Stoics, and the grounds of his antagonism to the Epicureans. §3 deals with Cicero's aim in writing his philosophical works, and their character. It is admitted that his works are in great part free translations of Greek originals, which he adapted to the form of dialogue, interspersing illustrations drawn from the history and literature of his own country. It is claimed, however, that many of the apparent inconsistencies and superficial contradictions existed already in the Greek works from which Cicero drew. §4 enters in detail into the history and contents of the two editions of the *Academica*. §5 examines the Greek sources, coming to this conclusion, "It was composed of two long fragments of Antiochus, taken from different works, two of Philo from the same work, four of Clitomachus from three or four different works." §6 gives a brief account of the philosophical controversy contained in the *Academica*. §7 discusses the text, MSS, editions, etc. §8 touches upon the orthography of the edition. §9 contains an analysis and summary of the subject-matter.

It would be impossible to notice here with any fulness the passages where Mr. Reid has emended the text, or by some new interpretation or punctuation has defended the MS reading against the changes of previous editors. In general it may be said that he is much more conservative than Orelli, Halm or C. F. W. Müller, and displays everywhere great independence of judgment.

A few particulars may be noted. In I 1, 2 he keeps *satis eum*. In I 2, 5 he defends *et . . . etiam* and cites other passages from Cicero where it is too well attested to be thrust aside. In I 2, 5 he shows that *ne a nobis quidem* does not necessarily mean 'not even from us,' often having simply the sense of 'not . . . either,' 'auch nicht.' In I 2, 6 the insertion of *ecce* before *haec* does not seem particularly happy, while in I 2, 8 the reading *philosophis scribere* gives with slight changes most satisfactory sense. In I 3, 10 there is an interesting orthographical note on *incohasti*. In I 4, 16 the ellipsis with *nihil ad* is examined, and the conclusion drawn that there is no need with Halm to insert *valere* in the text. In I 5, 18 Mr. Reid gives a good note on the ellipse of a pronominal subject with the infinitive, and wisely refrains from inserting *me* before *exhibiturum*. In I 8, 31 good reasons are given for reading *rerum esse*, not *esse rerum* with Halm, which would give a perfect iambic line. In I 10, 37 an apparent carelessness of Cicero is shown to rest upon an inaccuracy of the Stoic writers themselves. In II 1, 2, *pace* is defended as adverbial in the sense of *tranquillo*. In II 6, 16 there is a good defence of *incognita*. In II 16, 51 will be found an interesting note on Cicero's use of *simul ut*. The general index at the end of the book will be found very useful by those wishing to learn the Ciceronian usage of particular words. The edition as a whole is one of which English scholarship may well be proud.

M. WARREN.

Studia Plautina scripsit GULIELMUS ABRAHAM. Commentatio ex supplementis Annalium Philologicorum seorsum expressa. Lipsiae, Teubner, 1884. 63 pp.

In this dissertation, evidently the fruit of great industry, numerous passages in the different plays of Plautus are examined with a view to the ascertainment of the Plautine usage of particular words, as well as to the settlement of the text where the MSS and the editors disagree. In Ps. 523:

Studeo hercle audire, nam ted ausculto lubens
Agedum, nam satis libenter te ausculto loqui

it is shown that the first verse agrees with Plautine usage, while the second contravenes it in using *libenter* for *lubens*, in joining *ausculto* with an infinitive, and in the use of *agedum* without a following imperative. Ritschl was therefore wrong in attempting to fuse the two verses into one:

Agedum: studeo hercle audire: te ausculto lubens

By similar argument in Mr. 983:

Temperare istac aetate istis decet te artibus
Vacuum esse istac ted aetate his decebat noxiis,

it is shown that the first verse is Plautine, the second un-Plautine and to be rejected. *Vocivum* would be the Plautine form (here against the metre), and the genitive, not the ablative, the Plautine construction. The transposition of the first verse, doubtfully proposed by the writer,

Témpere istís decet te<d> ístac aetate ártibus,

has little to commend it.

Tu. 374 gives occasion for a very thorough examination of all the cases found in Plautus of the verbs *posco* and *postulo* and their compounds. The conclusion reached is that *poscere ab aliquo* is not a Plautine construction, and that Plautus nowhere else joins *poscere* and *postulare*. The following emendation based on the reading of the Palatine MSS is proposed: *Plus pollicere qudm ego te <dare> postulo*. The use of *domi*, *domo*, *domum* (*domos*) is exhaustively examined, with some good textual suggestions, the most interesting being to read *exferi domo* in Mr. 419 for *exferri domo* and to consider *domo* a dative. In like manner Plautus' use of the singular *foris* is considered, and the use of *praeda* with *de* and *cum*, the only prepositions with which it occurs. As Plautus uses *temperi* twenty times and *per tempus* five times, the inference is drawn that *in tempore* is un-Plautine, and the two passages where it occurs, Am. 877 and Cp. 836, are accordingly emended; but as Terence uses *in tempore* for *temperi* regularly, it is a little rash to deny that the usage may not have begun in Plautus. The construction of *prohibere*, the prosody of *deus*, the use of *ad forum* and *apud forum*, and of *ibo ut conveniam* are examined in full. Then follow a great number of miscellaneous conjectures to the different plays arranged in alphabetical order. Many of these are ingenious, and most of them are well supported by parallel passages and a reference to the general usage of Plautus. In not a few cases the readings accepted by Goetz are proved to be wrong. Often the emendation suggested involves too great a departure from the MSS to command instant assent, however good sense it may make, e. g. in Au. 263 the MSS give *íbo* *igitur*, *parábo*: *numquid mé vis?* *Istuc fiet vale*, where the metre shows that there is some corruption in the last three words. Dr. Abraham compares Ci. I 1, 120 and seven other passages, and says 'vix dubitabis idem quod Ci. I 1, 120, legitur etiam hoc loco Plauto restituere': *numquid mé vis? Ut valeds. Vale*. If we compare, however, Asin. 108 (Goetz),

Ego eo ad forum, nisi quid vis. | Ei, bene ambula:

where the MSS have *fiet ne*, and Camerarius read *i, etiamne ambulas* (the reading *bene ambula* is due to Fleckeisen, and leaves the *et* of *fiet* unaccounted for), we may be tempted to find in FIET here too a corruption of EI ET. The emendation proposed for Am. 253,

Haec illi sic pugnata pugnast usque a mani ad vesperum,

is due to Studemund, and the whole dissertation, which is dedicated to him, doubtless owes much to his inspiration. The criticism is very minute, but minute criticism to-day often overthrows the brilliant guesses of the master Ritschl.

M. WARREN.

The Tale of Gamelyn. From the Harleian MS No. 7334, collated with six other MSS. Edited with Notes and a Glossarial Index by the Rev. WALTER W. SKEAT, M. A., LL. D. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1884.

In the small compass of sixty-four pages Professor Skeat has given us a very handy edition of The Tale of Gamelyn, which deserved this separate reproduction both from a linguistic and a literary point of view. While it is no longer regarded as written by Chaucer, having been in fact written about the

time of Chaucer's birth (1340), it was, doubtless, found by some copyist among his papers, and if he had lived to complete the *Canterbury Tales*, we should, in all probability, have had it worked over and put into the mouth of the Yeoman, as Urry first suggested in his edition of Chaucer (1721), and Mr. Skeat concurs. The misnomer under which it appears in some editions of Chaucer, "The Cokes Tale of Gamelyn," is due to its position in the MSS immediately after the imperfect Cook's Tale, but Mr. Skeat says (p. xiv, note) that this title in the best MS, Harl. 7334, from which he prints, "is merely scribbled as a head-line to the pages in a much later hand than that of the original scribe." From three of the best MSS of the *Canterbury Tales*, and one other, it is omitted altogether, though it is found in at least ten MSS. The metre alone is sufficient to deny it to Chaucer, but the language also has a more archaic cast than his, and justifies the earlier date.

Mr. Skeat has provided an excellent Introduction, with notice of the grammar and metre, notes, and a glossary. The Tale belongs to the Robin Hood series, shows close connection with "A Poem on the Times of Edward II," assigned to about 1320, and was written probably not long after the poem. Its language resembles the later writings of Robert of Brunne, and it is a good representative of the East Midland dialect of that period. It has few Scandinavian words, not more than twenty, half of which occur in Chaucer, and not very many Norman-French words, about 160 in the 902 lines of the Tale.

It is valuable in literature from having supplied the prototype of Lodge's novel, "Euphues' Golden Legacy," on which Shakspeare based his "As You Like It." Mr. Skeat gives a short sketch of the story as it appears in Lodge's novel, the latter part of which is unlike the Tale of Gamelyn. In respect to the metre Mr. Skeat finds seven types of the first half-line, three with three accents and four with four accents; and the second half-line usually has three accents. This arrangement seems objectionable; the line appears to be rather a derivative from the Anglo-Saxon long line, the first half-line containing two or three accents, and the second usually two, more than one unaccented syllable coming between the accented syllables. The rules for final *-e* apply here as in Chaucer, and the grammar is similar, though the inflexions are somewhat fuller. The book is well edited, and will further the study of Middle English, for promoting which we are already so much indebted to the Clarendon Press and its able editors.

J. M. GARNETT.

Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der Germanischen Philologie. Herausgegeben von der Gesellschaft für Deutsche Philologie in Berlin. Sechster Jahrgang, 1884.

The second part of the sixth annual volume of the above work has just appeared, completing the volume. In addition to the sections heretofore included, one has been inserted on the Sixteenth Century, so that the work presents now a complete annual bibliography of all works, dissertations, periodical essays, and book-notices that appear in the department of Germanic philology to the 16th century inclusive. The present volume, with the Registers of Names and Subjects, comprises 418 pages, of which the section appropriated

to English covers 59 pages and 259 titles, embracing the following sub-sections: General Works, Lexicography, Phraseology, Etymology, Dialects, Scottish Text Society, History of Language and Grammar, Metre, History of Literature, Chrestomathies, Special Works: *a.* Old English, *b.* Middle English. This section is edited by Dr. J. Koch. In addition to the German journals, the Academy and the Athenaeum, and the American Journal of Philology have been examined for essays and book-notices, so that the bibliography may claim to be the most complete published, and can be cordially recommended to students of Germanic philology in all of its subdivisions.

To those who have not access to the German philological journals, it is very useful in giving a summary of what has been published, with a brief abstract of contents and of the opinions of reviewers.

The price too is moderate, being eight marks in the book-stores, but to members of the *Gesellschaft* the volume is sent for six marks, post-free. It aims to include all works that appear from one October to the next, and the MS of the present volume was closed May 12, 1885. The treasurer of the *Gesellschaft* is Karl Kinzel, Friedenau bei Berlin, to whom subscriptions should be sent.

J. M. GARNETT.

N. B.—Authors and publishers, especially in Germany, of dissertations and other works relating to English philology, who desire to have them noticed in the American Journal of Philology, are requested to send a copy to the editor of the Journal, Professor B. L. Gildersleeve, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, or to Professor J. M. Garnett, University of Virginia, Virginia, U. S. A.

Le Theatre D'Alexandre Hardy. Erster Neudruck der Dramen von Pierre Corneille's unmittelbarem Vorläufer nach den Exemplaren der Dresdener, Münchener und der Wolfenbütteler Bibliothek besorgt von E. STENGEL. 5 Bände, 8vo. Marburg, Elwert; Paris, Le Soudier, 1884.

In Vol. IV, p. 97 of this Journal, notice was taken of the *Sammlung Französischer Neudrucke*, edited by Prof. Karl Vollmöller of Göttingen, and the importance of the series was noted in view of the difficulty that Romance scholars generally experience in obtaining original editions of Middle-French authors. The timeliness of such reprints has been fully shown by the fact that several numbers of the Vollmöller publication have already received that attention from scholars which they deserve, considering the high esteem set on them, as literary creations, by contemporaries of their authors, and their present great value for purely linguistic purposes. When these monuments of the sixteenth century shall have become thus generally accessible to the student of language, we may expect light to be thrown on many of the puzzling problems of Modern French syntax and versification. The beginnings of Gallic speech have been for years the object of earnest investigation, and sufficient has already been done in this direction to give a survey of the most important laws that obtained in the historic development of this branch of the Neo-Latin idioms during the first transition period from the old to the new, from the fully synthetic to

the semi-synthetic stage of speech ; but the second transition period, the transference of semi-synthetic into purely analytic products ; the important process of recasting and setting to a single mould (the logical order of phrase elements) the double taxis (grammatical and logical) of the Latin ; the origin and growth of new forms of poetic expression—these are subjects that are beginning only to claim the attention of scholars in this young department of philology ; and for the examination of them, cheap and handy reprints of such works as the Tragedies of Garnier and others are indispensable.

In the work mentioned at the head of this notice we have, belonging to this same period of language, another important publication, which inaugurates a second series of Mid. French reprints, edited by Prof. Ed. Stengel, of Marburg. The selection of the author chosen to open the collection, Alexandre Hardy, is appropriate in that he represents the next step in the development of French literature after Garnier. In the latter, the greatest dramatic poet of the XVI century, we have a continuation of the tradition as established by Jodelle, whose chief character is found in a slavish imitation of the ancients.¹ His mission was to reproduce the Greek and Roman drama in French dress,² and consequently he did not reach the sympathies of the French people ; while Hardy, on the contrary, for the first time in the literature, produced pieces whose immediate object was to draw the common folk. He did away entirely with the servile following of the classics, and through his clear and natural language, the variety of his representation, and his wonderful productive power, established a new school of literature whence came Mairet, Rotrou and Corneille. As the veritable founder of the Modern French theatre,³ as the representative of the liberty and franchise of the modern literary *Geist* in France, it is peculiarly fitting that he should stand at the head of a series of reprints which shall represent the authors that gave the original impulse to this movement. The popularity which he enjoyed for nearly half a century is a strong reason too why we should study him to-day, when all the elements are being carefully noted that gave coloring to the early make-up of our different literatures. In the short space of thirty years (1593-1623) he composed over five hundred pieces, and during this time was connected with the celebrated Théâtre du Marais, of Paris, the repertory of which was composed exclusively of his works. In this prodigious fecundity of Hardy's genius, the celebrated founder of the Spanish theatre, Lope de Vega, who produced eighteen hundred pieces, is the only writer that can be compared to him. Hardy's intimate relation, furthermore, to Corneille, whose teacher and counsellor he was, lends a particular interest to his works, from which the author of *Cinna* confesses to have drawn much of his early inspiration. In his *Examen de Méliete*, Corneille writes, "Je n'avais pour guide qu'un peu de sens commun, avec les exemples de feu Hardy."

Of Hardy's numerous dramas, there have come down to us only forty-one pieces, distributed in five volumes as followed by the present editor. Vols.

¹ Cf. Darmresteter et Hatzfeld, *Le Seizième Siècle en France. Première Partie*, p. 162.

² Lotheissen, *Geschichte der Französ. Lit. im XVII Jahrh.* Vol. I, p. 297.

³ Guizot, *Corneille et son temps*, p. 130.

III, IV and V were never printed but once before, while of Vol. II a second edition is extant, but it is so rare that it could not be had for this reprint. Of Vol. I two editions appeared in France and one in Germany, but the editor has not been able to find the latter so as to make use of it. We have, then, for the text before us, the whole of the first edition with the exception of the second French edition of the first volume, that contains eight pieces. Hardy's works, as existing in the Dresden, Wolfenbüttel and Munich libraries, have been drawn on for the Marburg publication. They stand in the following relation to one another for the volumes they possess :

Dresden,	I ²	II	III	IV	...
Wolfenbüttel,	I ²	II	III	IV	V
Munich,	I

A comparison of the Munich copy of the first edition of Vol. I with copies of the same Vol. for Dresden and Wolfenbüttel showed the second edition to be much the better one of the two, and consequently it has been selected here to work from.

So far as form is concerned the editor has kept everything of the original except the long *s*, even down to the most trivial mistakes of the old copy. For readers who should like to examine more closely the recent investigations on Hardy and his works it may be well to cite Lotheissen, *Geschichte der Französ. Lit. im XVII Jahrhundert*, B. I, 297 et seq.; Lombard, *Étude sur Alexandre Hardy*, *Zeitschrift für Neufranzös. Sprache und Literatur*, B. I, 161-185 et 348-397; Nagel, *Stengel's Ausgaben und Abhandlungen auf dem Gebiete der romanischen Philologie*, Heft XXVIII. The text is preceded by a set of *variae lectiones* drawn from the first edition of Vol. I, and also by a long list of emendations suggested for each volume separately.

Prof. Stengel promises for the following number of this series to give us the dramatic compositions of Montchrestien and of other important writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

A. M. ELLIOTT.

REPORTS.

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. XII, Part 2.

Herwerden opens this part, pp. 113-128, with notes on the Iliad, of which two or three may be here cited. On E 770, ὅσων δ' ἡροειδὲς ἀνὴρ ἶδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν | ἡμενος ἐν σκοπιῇ he proposes to read ἡροειδέ' as dative to agree with σκοπιῇ, since the passage as it stands "sine artificio explicari nequit." So in μ 232 we have ἡροειδέα πέτρην. Θ 349: Ἐκτωρ δ' ἀμφιπεριστρώφα καλλίτριχας ἵππους | Γοργόος οἶματ' ἔχων ἡὲ βροτολογιοῦ Ἄρηος. Here Nauck has preferred οἶματ', the reading of Aristarchus ("cuius tamen crisi non admodum favere assolet"), which H. thinks can be proved inferior to δμματ'. He argues that the noun οἶμα and its verb οἶμᾶν are used by Homer only "ubi sermo fit de leone vel de aquila similive ave aut de hominibus cum his animalibus comparatis," citing Π 751; Φ 252; X 149; 308. He then proceeds to show that about Gorgo "nihil fabula de impetu docet, sed docet de torvo atque horrendo vultu," and that the Scholiasts evidently understood the passage of the looks, referring as they do to A 36 and A 225. Lastly he observes that "οἶματα parum apte tribui homini stanti in curru. Aequiore animo de equorum impetu istud vocabulum usurpatum ferremus, ut arbitrator. Tandem audeamus confiteri cum Nauckio Aristarchum non fuisse tam magnum criticum quam haberetur ab antiquis et etiam nunc habeatur a multis." M 283, καὶ τ' ἐφ' ἄλλος πολιῆς κέχνηται λιμέσιν τε καὶ ἄκταις | κύμα δέ μιν προσΠΛΑζον ἐρύκεται. H. is inclined with Nauck to think this passage spurious: anyhow "quisquis illos [versus] composuit uti non potuit verbo προσπλάζειν, si quidem πλάζειν significat πλανᾶν nec ponitur pro πελάζειν, quod verbum non nisi in aoristo et perfecto passivo admittit syncopen." He proposes to substitute προσΚΑΥζον, and the simple verb in Φ 270, where the conjecture had occurred also to Nauck. (He would probably make a similar alteration in λ 583, Τάνταλον . . . ἐστεῶτ' ἐν λίμνῃ· ἡ δὲ προσέπλαζε γενεΐφ.) N 754, ἡ ῥα, καὶ ὠρμήθη, ὅρεϊ νιφέντι εὐοικῶς, | κεκληγῶς, διὰ δὲ Τρώων πέτετ' ἡδ' ἐπικούρων. "Veterem Scholiastam si audimus, poeta τὸ ἄγριον αὐτοῦ καὶ φοβερὸν ὄρει παρειαίνει χιόνι κεκαλυμμένῳ· τὸ γὰρ ἀνιφὸς πάντως καὶ ἡμερον. Si quis in monte nive tecto et glacie rigido versatur, huic sane quae oculis proxima se offert species horrorem incutit, sed quicumque e longinquo eiusmodi montem conspicit, huic pulcher videtur et augustus . . . Multo vero magis suspectam mihi reddunt veterem scripturam quae verba imagini coniuncta reperimus, ὠρμήθη, κεκληγῶς, et πέτετο, omnia sic comparata ut eorum auctorem Hectorem non monti nive tecto sed avi alicui rapaci comparasse suspicemur. Ipsa vero verba quibus usus est certa coniectura assequi frustra conatus sum. Paucis enim, sat scio, persuadebo, si collato Od. v 87 scribendum proposuero: ἡ ῥα καὶ ὠρμήθη κίρκῳ ἰρηκί εὐοικῶς κτέ. Quaerant ingeniosiores." In ψ 839 of Epeius it is said that σῶλον ἔλε . . . ἦκε δὲ δινήσας, γέλασαν δ' ἐπὶ πάντες Ἀχαιοί. "Frustra veteres interpretes desudarunt in explicando cur

Graeci riserint": probably that Schol. is right who says he was ridiculous ἐπ' ὀλίγον βαλὼν. But "debuit poeta eam imperitiam clare significare; quare suspicor eum dedisse, ἡκΑ δὲ δίνῃσ' EN . . . Ad adverbii usum conferas Ω 508; σ 92; Ψ 336; Υ 301; Ρ 254."

In the next article, pp. 129-170, Cobet continues his notes on Stein's Herodotus, now on books V and VI. His first remark is on v 2, τὰ μὲν δὴ ἀπὸ Παιόνων πρότερα γενόμενα ὧδε ἐγένετο. "Legendum τὰ . . . Ὑπὸ Παιόνων γενόμενα. Sexcenties in libris sic peccatur. Audio esse qui vitiosa subtilitate nescio quid tenuissimi discriminis inter γενέσθαι ὑπὸ τινος et ἀπὸ τινος commenti sint metaphysicis quam grammaticis digniora facientes." After illustrating the normal construction of the agent with passive verbs he proceeds, "eadem ratio est verborum quae quum formam neutrorum habeant passivorum naturam et notionem induerunt. Ἀποκτείνειν habet passivum ἀποθνήσκειν et ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὸ τινος non est *mori* sed interfici ab aliquo . . . Magna est talium copia, quorum nonnulla colligere iuvat ut ingeniosi iuvenes veterum litterarum studiosi his exemplis admoniti inter legendum hoc agant et similia hisce et ipsi invenire discant." Cobet proceeds to illustrate at considerable length this relation between βάλλειν and πίπτειν and their respective compounds; between the aor. and perf. of τύπτειν and πληγὰς λαβεῖν and εἰληφέναι; between ἀποκτείναι and ἀποθανεῖν, διώκειν and φεύγειν, κατὰγειν and κατεῖναι, εὖ λέγειν and εὖ ἀκούειν. "Similiter ποιεῖν τινά τι (εὖ, κακῶς πλείστα καὶ μέγιστα ἀγαθὰ) habet passivum πάσχειν (εὖ, κακῶς, πολλὰ δεινὰ) ὙΠΟ τινος. Contra, ubi ποιεῖν non habet personae objectum sed rei, passivum est γίγνεσθαι, apud Herodotum etiam ποιεῖσθαι, τὸ ποιούμενον, τὰ ποιούμενα, plane ut Latine FACERE et FIERI. Aperitissime id cernitur in nota periphrasi per verbum ποιεῖσθαι, ut λόγους ποιεῖσθαι pro λέγειν, ἀνάρρησιν ποιεῖσθαι pro ἀναγορεύειν, τὴν παράδοσιν ποιεῖσθαι pro παρίεναι et aliis sexcentis; quae quum in formam passivam convertenda sunt videbis summa constantia dici λόγοι γίνονται, ἡ ἀνάρρησις γίγνεται cett. et sic apud Herodotum V 21, quia pro ζητεῖν dicitur ζητήσιν ποιεῖσθαι legitur: ζήτησις . . . ἐκ τῶν Περσέων ἐγένετο. Rectissime igitur dicitur γενέσθαι, τὰ γενόμενα, ὑπὸ τινος, πρὸς τινος, ἐκ τινος, sed neque παρὰ τινος neque ἀπὸ τινος eo sensu Graecum est . . . Itaque apud Herodotum τὰ ὑπὸ Παιόνων πρότερον γενόμενα ὧδε ἐγένετο optime habet. Perinde bene dicere poterat τὰ πρὸς Παιόνων γενόμενα et τὰ ἐκ Παιόνων γενόμενα, sed τὰ ΑΠΟ Παιόνων γενόμενα et similia scribarum sunt vitia et flagitia. QUOD ERAT DEMONSTRANDUM." Cobet repeats what he has said before as to the superior accuracy of the tradition of the fifth book: "permirum est per tot saecula, post tot discrimina rerum, post tot pericula et a scribarum socordia et a sciolorem levitate, egregii scriptoris librum saluum et incolumem ad nos pervenire posse." It has probably reached us "ex Codice aliquanto antiquiore et emendatiore," an indication of which is that at the end of it we find in Cod. A the "στοιχομετρία sic: XXHH ΗΡΟΔΟΤΟΥ Ε." Of the many notes on Book VI only one can be here given. "vi 57: Scribit Herodotus: ἦν δὲ μὴ ἐλθῶσι (reges Spartanorum in curiam) τοὺς μάλιστα σφί τῶν γερόντων προσήκοντας ἔχειν τὰ τῶν βασιλέων γέρεα δύο ψήφους τιθεμένους τρίτην δὲ τὴν ἐνωτῶν. Duriter ob haec verba Thucydides Herodotum increpat I 20: πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ἐτι καὶ νῦν ὄντα—καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι Ἕλληνες οὐκ ὁρθῶς οἰοῦνται ὥσπερ τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίων βασιλεῖς μὴ μὲν ψήφῳ προστίθεσθαι ἐκάτερον ἀλλὰ δύοιν. Etiam alibi sic tecte et

sine nomine Herodotum reprehendit Thucydides . . . sed nunc quidem virum gravissimum fugit ratio et (quamquam permirum dictu est) Herodoti verba male intellexit. Nempe ex senatorum numero *unus et idem*, qui proxima cognatione utrumque regem contingebat ferebat in curia suffragia duo duorum regum absentium quibus suum tertium addebat. Fallere potuit Thucydidem pluralis numerus *τοὺς μάλιστα προσήκοντας*, sed eo numero usus est Herodotus, quia modo hic modo ille ex proximis cognatis duorum regum absentium vicem explebat numeribusqueungebatur. Ceterum tantillam rem tam aspere insectari, ne dicam dolo, est *σημείον μικροψυχίας*."

The next article, pp. 171-185, contains critical notes, by Prof. Badham, on the 12th book of Plato's *Leges*. From this only the first paragraph can be here quoted. "In libro duodecimo haud minus quam in superioribus multa sunt, quae primo aspectu tam misere corrupta iudicabis, ut iis immorari vix operae pretium videatur. Sed simul atque cum duobus scribis et duplici incuria tibi rem esse senseris, facilis emendandi via repente aperietur. Cuius rei tale exemplum proferam, in quo multus controversiae locus esse possit. In p. 954 e haec leguntur: *τοῖς δὲ ἀνθρώποις ὅσα τροφὴν μήτηρ οὖσα ἢ γῆ πρὸς ταῦτα πέφυκε βοῦλεσθαι φέρειν, μήτε ζῶν μήτε τις ἀποθανὼν στερεῖτω τὸν ζῶνθ' ἡμῶν*. Corrige *πρὸς τροφὴν* π. β. *φέρειν*, *ταῦτα μήτε ζῶν κ. τ. ε.* Scilicet *τροφὴν* et *ταῦτα* inter scribendum ommissa, in margine posita erant. Tum qui illum codicem describebat, voces ommissas ita restituit ut malum augeret."

In an article entitled '*Homerica Posteriora*,' pp. 185-214, Naber complains that a book he published six years ago, called *Quaestiones Homericae*, in which he tried to show "in Iliade quatuor quasi aetates distingui posse," some of his German critics censured without having taken the trouble to understand it; and that one in particular did so after reading only the last page, on which he had placed '*totius operis conspectum*.' This person based his review on a misapprehension of the figures there given, which Naber confesses were not stated with as much lucidity as was desirable; but no such misunderstanding could have arisen if the book had been read in which he had quoted "*ipsos locos ubique αὐτολεξεῖ*." He does not propose now to go over the same ground, but intends merely to emend some corrupt passages. He finds a good many of them throughout the Odyssey. On a 414, οὐτ' οὖν ἀγγελίης ἐτι πείθομαι, εἶποθεν ἔλθοι, he writes: "Quaero quodnam subiectum sit verbi *ἔλθοι* idque olim etiam quaesitum fuisse arbitror ab iis qui ἀγγελίῃ rescripserunt; sed etiamsi hiatus hic fortasse excusari possit, non tamen poterit non offensioni esse." He proposes to write οὐτ' οὖν ἀγγελίης ἐτι πείθομαι, εἶποθεν ἔλθοι, saying "synonyma esse *πέθεσθαι* et *ἀκούειν* Aristarchus docuit ad B 119 et K 381; praeterea conferri possunt P 641: *πεπύσθαι λυγρῆς ἀγγελίης* et β 256: *ἀγγελιάων πέυσσεται εἰν Ἰθάκῃ*, quae Leocriti de Telemacho verba sunt." In ζ 63 Nausicaa says she has five brothers, οἱ δὲ ὀπνύοντες, τρεῖς δ' ἡίθεοι θαλέθοντες. "Hic primum miror singularem usum verbi *ὀπνύειν*, quod nusquam sic absolute usurpatur. Deinde cur duo illi Alcinoi filii maiores praeterea non memorantur? In octavo certe libro non fit mentio nisi trium adolescentium Laodamantis Halii et Clytonai. Dixeris vero similiter pueros fuisse, cum ludis non intersint. Fortasse legendum est: οἱ δύο παῖδ' ὄντε vel simile quid in eam sententiam." θ 264: *πέπληγον δὲ χορὸν θεῖον ποσίν*. "nonne scribendum *χορὸν λείον*?

Δείησαν certe, vs. 260. Cf. ψ 359." μ 250: ἐμὲ δὲ φθέγγοντο καλεῦντες | ἐξονομα-
κλήδην, τότε γ' ὕστατον, ἀχνύμενοι κῆρ. "Ridicule propemodum additur illud
ἀχνύμενοι κῆρ, de miseris militibus, quos Scylla rapuerat. Magis ad rem est
ἀχνύμενον." ο 373: τῶν ἐφαγόν τ' ἐπιόν τε καὶ αἰδοίοισιν ἔδωκα, on which Cobet
wrote "ne mulierculae offenderentur commentum sunt grammatici aliquid, quod
difficile est sine risu audire. Nempe αἰδοίοισιν ἔδωκα esse ἰκέταις καὶ αἰδοῦς
ἀξίοις ἔδωκα. Poterat Eumaeus πτωχοῖς τισι καὶ ἀλῆταις aliquid dedisse, et ἰκέται
αἰδοῖοι usitate dicebantur, sed non αἰδοῖοι per se *supplices* significabat. Sed
honus erat habendus auribus matronarum." Cobet therefore understood that
Homer used αἰδοίοισιν in the sense which is elsewhere in the Odyssey expressed
by μήδεα. This Naber cannot believe. "Quid igitur Homerus scripsit, cum
αἰδοίοισιν scribere non potuerit? Mendicos Eumaeus hospitio excipere solebat,
sicuti Ulysses excepit. Hoc obtinebimus sic: τῶν ἐφαγόν τ' ἐπιόν τε καὶ
αἰτίζουσιν ἔδωκα. Nequam homines fuerunt qui scripserunt αἰδοίοισιν . . . Iidem
homunciones putarunt αἰδοῖον eunuchum esse, quod αἰδοῖα non haberet, cf.
Schol. γ 267. Nihil egerim nisi haec omnia ipsi Cobeto persuasero."

We have next, pp. 215-225, notes *ad Taciti Annales*, by J. J. Cornelissen. He speaks feelingly of the loss to Latin scholarship in the death of Carl Halm. "Exquisita linguae scientia cum iudicii subtilitate atque acumine rara felicitate in eo coniuncta erant. Etsi bonorum codicum auctoritatem maximi, ut par est, facere solebat, tamen nunquam vulgatam scripturam tam anxie et superstitiose defendit, ut non sanae et rectae rationi plurimam vimtribuendam censeret. Qua singulari erat humanitate, ea quae ipse excogitarat non dubitabat omittere, quoties alios probabiliora invenisse videbat. In omnibus denique, quae evulgavit, scriptis varia eius et multiplex doctrina accurataque antiquitatis notitia non minus legentium admirationem movent, quam scribendi elegantia orationisque decus et nitor. His virtutibus Halmius nomen suum posteritati commendavit. Vigebit clarissimi viri memoria dum his litteris suis manebit honos veraeque et sanae philologiae studium celebrabitur." Of the notes that follow there is none that touches any matter of general interest, and none of the conjectures has any high degree of probability.

On pp. 226-7 H. W. Van der Mey offers corrections of three passages in the Gallic War and of one in the Civil War of Caesar.

On pp. 228-32 we have more notes on the Odyssey by J. J. Hartman. He recently read the poem in Nauck's edition and greatly admired its "ingentem copiam pulcherrimarum emendationum . . . Operaene pretium fecerim an Homero non magis ego profuerim, quam Corinthiis Diogenes, nunc lector videat." In δ 665 ἐκ τόσσων δ' ἄφεκτι νέος πάις οἴχεται αὐτῷς | νῆα Φερρυσάμενος κρίνας τ' ἀνὰ δῆμον ἀρίστους. | ἄρξει καὶ προτέρῳ κακὸν ἐμμεναι, he ingeniously suggests that we may get rid at once of the difficulty of the absolute use of ἀέκητι and the asyndeton of the third line by reading εἰ for ἐκ. λ 193: "De Laerte: πάντη Φοῖ κατὰ γυνὸν ἁλώης Φοινοπέδοιο | φύλλων κεκλιμένων χθαμαλαὶ βεβλήνται εἶναι. Quid sit φύλλα κεκλιμένα scire pervelim. Interea suspicor κεκλιμένω." π 305: καὶ κέ τεο δμῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐτι πειρηθεῖμεν, | ἦ μὲν ὅπου τις νῶϊ τίει καὶ δείδει θυμῷ, "Nullus hic locus est adverbio loci ὅπου, sed, quemadmodum vs. sq. legitur ἦ δ' ὅτις οὐκ ἄλέγει κτέ., ita hic quoque expecto ἦ μὲν ὅτις πον νῶϊ τίει. Particula πον dubitationem quandam habet, versui nostro aptis-

simam." "v 38, Minervae ita consolanti: τίπτ' αὐτ' ἐγρήσσεις, πάντων περὶ κάμμορε φωτῶν; | Φοῖκος μὲν τοι ὁδ' ἐστί, γυνή δέ τοι ἦδ' ἐνὶ Φοίκῳ | καὶ πάς, οἶόν ποῦ τις ἐφέλδεται ἐμμεναι νῖα, Ulysses respondet: ναὶ δὴ ταῦτά γε πάντα, θεά, κατὰ μοῖραν ἐφειπες· | ἀλλὰ τί μοι τόδε θυμὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μερμηρίζει, | ὅπως δὴ μνηστῆρσιν ἀναιδέσι χεῖρας ἐφήσω. Non ferendum videtur τι τόδε, ubi simplex τόδε requiritur. Ulysses hoc vult: verum est quod consolandi gratia dixisti, sed haec *etiam* restat cura. Hoc dicet, si scripserimus: ἀλλ' ἔτι μοι τόδε θ. ἐ. φ. μ."

On page 128 Mr. Postgate has a note on Sall. Jug. 78, 2, where in describing the Syrtes he says, "quorum proxima terrae praealta sunt, cetera, ubi fors tulit, alta ALIA in tempestate vadosa. Sub *alia* latet ALIAS quod ipsum et sententiae satis facit quae de mobili syrtium natura est, tranquillo altitudine haud mediocri, agitantibus fluctibus vadosarum, et alibi quoque in *alia aliis* cett. mutatum est velut apud ipsum Sallustium Cat. 10, 2."

XII, Part 3.

The first article in this number, pp. 233-245, is by J. J. Cornelissen, entitled *Spicilegium criticum ad Flori Epitomas*. The two most recent editors, O. Jahn and C. Halm, agreeing that the best Codices are the *Bambergensis* and the *Nazarianus*, are not at one as to the weight to be attached to each. This question remains unsettled, and will no doubt be hereafter discussed with advantage. "At multo plus salutis [libris Flori] exspecto ab arte critica coniecturali. Quicunque enim varias lectiones vel obiter inspexerit, facile videbit omnes libros, praeterquam quod suis quisque vitiis inquinati sint, mendis laborare gravissimis, quorum origo ad communem omnium fontem sit referenda . . . Qui igitur in Floro recensendo id tantum agit, ut variis lectionibus sedulo inter se collatis vetustissimi codicis, unde omnes nostri fluxerint, contextum restituat, is librum proferet incredibilem in modum corruptum et depravatum." Some of these evident errors C. pointed out in a former volume of *Mnemosyne*, and he here indicates others of the same sort. None of his remarks have any interest outside of the text on which he comments. They are all such as these. The text says of Horatius (i 3, 5), *hunc tam immaturum amorem virginis ultus est ferro*: "non amorem, opinor, sororis ultus est Horatius, sed *immaturum maerorem*." In ii 6, 16, Hannibal is said to have arranged his line of battle in a certain way, *quod et sol ibi acerrimus et plurimus pulvis et eurus ab oriente semper quasi ex constituto*: "o callidam observationem! qua eurus ab oriente flare sensit Hannibal. Noli credere, mi lector, has stultitias Florum effutivisse; scripsit nimirum *eurus oboriens semper quasi ex constituto*."

In pp. 246-282 we have Cobet's notes on books VII and VIII of Stein's Herodotus. There is very little of general interest to be found in them; but two or three excerpts may be made. viii 3, *δοκέειν δ' ἐμοὶ καὶ ἀνευ ταύτης τῆς ὑποθήκης βασιλεύσαι ἂν Ξέρξης*. "Ex Vaticano Codice reponendum *ἐβασίλευσε ἂν*, namque *δοκέειν δ' ἐμοὶ*, ut *ὥς δ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ*, extra constructionem positum est neque ullo modo cum *Ξέρξης* componi potest." vii 76, *ἀσπίδας δὲ ὡμοβοίνας εἶχον σμικράς, καὶ προβόλους δύο Λυκιοεργέας ἕκαστος εἶχε*. "Probabile admodum est Steinii supplementum: (ΠΙΣΙΔΑΙ) *δὲ ἀσπίδας ὡμοβοίνας εἶχον*. Qui libros vetustissimos saeculo primo aut secundo post Christum aut etiam antea

discriptos mendis caruisse putant vehementer falluntur. Athenaeus pag. 486e hunc Herodoti locum laudans ex libro suo protulit : προβόλους δύο Λυκιοεργέας, quod quum mendosum esse sensisset suspicatus est an forte Λυκιοεργέας esset vera lectio : μήποτ' οὐν καὶ παρὰ τῷ Ἡροδότῳ, ὡς καὶ παρὰ τῷ Δημοσθένει γραπτέον ΛΥΚΙΟεργέας, ἢ ἀκούηται τὰ ἐν Λυκίᾳ εἰργασμένα . . . Inspiciamus nunc libros nostros : in AB est λυκεργέας, absurdum vocabulum, in R Λυκοεργέας id ipsum quod Athenaeus legebat, unde existimari potest quam sit vetustum mendum. Etiam illi vehementer errant qui doctissimis grammaticis multum tribuunt. Didymus ὁ χαλκέντερος quum Commentarios in Demosthenem scriberet ad [49. 31] annotavit λυκιουργεῖς esse τὰς ὑπὸ Λυκίου κατεσκευασμένας : quem turpem errorem Athenaeus redarguens ἀγνοεῖ, inquit, ὁ γραμματικὸς ὅτι τὸν τοιοῦτον σχηματισμὸν ἀπὸ κυρίων ὀνομάτων οὐκ ἂν τις εὖροι γινόμενον, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ πλέων ἢ ἰθύνων. Mirum est ac prope incredibile hominem tam doctum in tanta copia nominum in—οεργής . . . in tam turpem errorem se induisse. Quam saepe legerat Ἀττικουργής Κορινθιουργής . . . et alia plura, quae non significant εἰργασμένα vel κατεσκευασμένα ἐν Ἀττικῇ sed Ἀττικῇ ὀπερῇ, τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἐργασίας, cett. et sic Herodotus dixerat προβόλους δύο Λυκιοεργέας, et Demosthenes φιάλας Λυκιουργεῖς." vii 145 : τὰ δὲ Γέλωνος πρήγματα μεγάλα ἐλέγετο εἶναι οὐδαμῶν Ἑλληνικῶν Τῶν οὐ πολλὸν μείζω. "In tali re dicitur οὐδεὶς ὅστις οὐ, οὐδενὸς ὅτου οὐ, οὐδενὶ ὅτῳ οὐ, et in plurali οὐδένων (Iones οὐδαμῶν) ὅτῳ (ὅτεων) οὐ, idque reponendum." vii 150 : ἐστὶ δὲ ἄλλος λόγος λεγόμενος . . . ὡς Ξέρξης ἐπεμψε κήρυκα ἐς Ἀργος . . . ἐλθόντα δὲ τοῦτον [λέγεται] εἰπεῖν ἄνδρες Ἀργεῖοι κτέ. "Inepte λέγεται de suo inseruit nescio quis qui Graecae compositionis in talibus rationem ignorabat. Praecedente enim oratione directa ab ὡς vel ὅτι incipiente, id quod continuo additur per γάρ aut δέ coniunctum necessario in oratione indirecta ponendum : ὡς Ξέρξης ἐπεμψε . . . ἐλθόντα ΔΕ τοῦτον εἰπεῖν." Cobet makes a similar remark on c. 166 and 168. vii 169 : ἡ δὲ Πυθίη ὑπεκρίνατο ὡς νήπιοι, ἐπιμέμψεσθε ὅσα ὑμῖν ἐκ τῶν Μενελάου τιμωρημάτων Μίνως ἐπεμψε μηνίων δακρύματα, ὅτι οἱ μὲν οὐ συνεξεπρήξαντο αὐτῷ τὸν ἐν Καμικῷ θάνατον γενόμενον, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐκείνοισι τὴν ἐκ Σπάρτης ἀρπασθεῖσαν ὑπ' ἀνδρὸς βαρβάρου γυναικα ; "In his unum vocabulum male lectum et sic non intellectum gravem corruptelam traxit. Quis intelligere potest in hac oppositione οἱ μὲν . . . ὑμεῖς δὲ, de quibus tandem οἱ μὲν sit dictum? Sed unum vocabulum melius lectum et intellectum omnia restituet in integrum. Erat in vetusto libro OTIOIMEN : suspicatus est aliquis OI esse articulum ὅτι οἱ μὲν, cui responderet ὑμεῖς δὲ. Sed OI pronomen est, ὅτι οἱ (sibi) μὲν, et sic renascitur vera oppositio quae perspicue apparet ex indirecta oratione. Minos ipse ita dixit : ἘΜΟΙ μὲν οὐ συνεξεπρήξαΣΘΕ τὸν . . . θάνατον . . . , ὑμεῖς δὲ ἘΚΕΙΝΟΙΣΙ τὴν ἀρπασθεῖσαν γυναικα . . . Tenemus nunc manifestum interpolatorem. Quum putaret OI esse articulum sequens συνεξεπρήξασθε stulte convertit in οἱ μὲν οὐ συνεξεπρήξαντο et de suo inseruit αὐτῷ . . . In loco, de quo agimus, mendosum est Μενελάου. Herodotus enim utitur forma Μενέλεως et eleganter τιμωρημάτων (ut ipsum τιμωρεῖν) cum dativo composuit . . . ἀρπάζειν et παίζειν apud veteres habent has formas : ἡρπασα, ἡρπασμαι, ἡρπάσθην, ἐπαισα, πεπαῖσθαι, apud sequiores ἀρπάξαι, ἀρπαχθῆναι, et ἐπαιξα, πέπαικται, deinde scribae has formas inter se miscent."

C. M. Francken, pp. 283-291, continues his notes *ad Ciceronis Palimpsestos*, in this part on that of the *de Republica*, which he thinks was written about the

beginning of the fifth century. He fills nearly two pages with illustrations of the readings of the MS and the corrections that are found on it: "antiqua enim manus, et fortasse eadem quae librum descripsit, multas nec leves correctiones addidit . . . bonae correctiones quae non sunt τοῦ τυχεύοντος raro ingenio librarii alicuius debentur, malas librarii esse probabile est; iam vides pravas correctiones, i. e. librarii, paene nullas factas esse, unde fere non ex ingenio emendasse correctorem demonstrari potest . . . nisi librarium hunc perfectum criticum credamus, concedamus necesse est, eum habuisse bonum in corrigendo quod sequeretur exemplum, sive diversum a prima manu, sive idem sed ab illa negligentius descriptum; quidquid est, sive accuratiore archetypi collatione sive ex praestantiori codice meliora dedit quam prima manus." This determination of the merit of the suggestions of the *manus altera* is important in regard to the interpretation of the passage in ii 22 about the *comitia centuriata*: "si modo dare velimus Ciceronem in computatione vitium potuisse committere, ut in addendo 89 poneret pro 99, omnia secundum alteram manum recte se habent." The latter part of this article is devoted to questions of orthography as determined by this Palimpsest. "Levis res est *orthographia* adeo, ut is qui anxia diligentia eam exploret seque in eo genere iactet, molestus videatur et ineptus; nec tamen neglegenda, si vere scripta, qualia ab antiquis legebantur, repraesentari velimus . . . quod si qui sunt, qui constantiam librariorum veterum desiderant, et contendant certum usum scribendi aut non extitisse aut non posse nunc constitui, reputent velim, quam incerto tibiae nitantur multa in etymologia, quae tamen iusta cura adhibitis copiis, quas Frid. Neue aliique sedulo congesserunt, exquirimus, perscrutamur, investigamus . . . sciantque etsi in multis vocabulis ratio certa non facile appareat, tamen pleraque satis constare." It appears among other things that there is considerable variation in the assimilation of the final consonant of a preposition to the initial sound of the word it is compounded with: "nullus est fere editor, quin assimilationem praepositionum cum antiquis codicibus omittat. Et tamen dubito an haec orthographia sit artificiosa et potius ad etymologiam quam ad pronuntiationem ficta. Fieri enim non potest quin raptim et saepe elata vocabula accommodentur: ante labiales *n* paene necessario transit in *m*; ita quoque quod erat olim *conlega* Tiberii tempore scribi desiit et *collega* factum . . . nec quisquam pronuntiando discrimen facere potest inter *adlinere* et *atlinere*, *obponere* et *usitatum opponere*."

We have next, pp. 293-318, from Herwerden, *Animadversiones ad Poetas Graecos*. Of these some thirty-five are on Theognis. In his recent edition of this poet Sitzler has adopted Welcker's conjecture that *Kύρνος* is not a proper but a common noun, analogous to *κεδνός*, *κυδνός*, *κλεινός*, with the meaning *summam potestatem tenens, dominus, nobilis*. He ought, says H., to have written *κυρνός*, which would be a possible form, though there is no proof of its existence; and as *Kύρνος* as a proper name occurs in Hdt. [i 167], it is more likely that it was actually in use at Megara; and that the poet in addressing the youth he wished to advise "sive verum sive fictum, propter haud obscuram nominis significationem hac potissimum compellatione usum esse, sub qua optimatum menti et auribus praecepta sua politica et moralia instillaret." The fictitious character of the name is rendered more probable by the patronymic *Πολυπαίδης*, which Schneidewin rightly assumes to belong to Cynus; "nempe

cum Πολυπαῖς, unde nomen ducitur, probabiliter idem significet quod πολυπάμων *i. e. dives*, nimis fortuitum videtur, eundem hominem nobilem simul *dominum* et *divitis filium* appellatum in suo paternoque nomine duplex omen coniunxisse." On 129, μήτ' ἀρετὴν εὐχον, Πολυπαῖδῃ, ἔξοχος εἶναι | μήτ' ἀφενος · μοῦνον δ' ἀνδρὶ γένοιτο τύχη, he writes: "Impium sane votum! Imo vero: μήτε τύχην εὐχον, Πολυπαῖδῃ, ἔξοχος εἶναι | μήτ' ἀφενος · μοῦνον δ' ἀνδρὶ γένοιτ' ἀρετή. Cf. infra 133 sq., 149 sq., 155 sq., 160 sq. Externa felicitas omnis pendet a deorum arbitrio." 557, φράζεο δ' ὁ κίνδυνός τοι ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἴσταται ἀκμῆς · κτέ. "Sic Cod. Mutinensis pro φράζεο · κίνδυνος, unde Bergk eiecto τοι coniecit φράζεο δῆ. At *res*, non *periculum*, in novaculae acie stare recte dicitur, et ubicumque haec HomERICA locutio occurrit reticetur subiectum, audiendumque est τὸ πρᾶγμα, τὸ ἔργον. Itaque conici: φράζεο δῆ κίνδυνος · ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἴσταται ἀκμῆς · ἄλλοτε πόλλ' ἔξεις, ἄλλοτε πανρότερα. Nisi forte sufficit: φράζεο δῆ · κίνδυνος · ἐπὶ κτέ." The remainder of the article contains notes on the Hecuba, the Hippolytus, and the Fragmenta of Euripides as in Dindorf's edition. Hec. 1270, θανοῦσα δ' ἡ ζῶσ' ἐνθάδ' ἐκπλήσω βίον; "Sive pro βίον cum Musgravio πότμον substituimus, sive cum Brunckio μόρον, sive λόγον (?) cum Prinzio, supra quam dici potest absurda manet oratio. Hoc video Hecubam rogare potuisse: *vivane an mortua fluctibus iactabor*, *i. e.* utrum in mare delapsa peribo an salva evadam, sed scripseritne poeta ἐν σάλῳ 'νεχθήσομαι an alio modo quaerere ex me noli." Fragm. 200, καὶ μὴν ὅσοι μὲν σαρκὸς εἰς εὐεξίαν | ἀσκοῦσι βίον, ἣν σφαλῶσι χρημάτων, | κακοὶ πολῖται. δεῖ γὰρ ἀνδρ' εἰθισμένον | ἀκόλαστον ἦθος γαστρὸς ἐν ταῖσιν μένειν. After discussing other attempts H. says: "Corrigo, una abiecta litterula: δεῖ γὰρ ἀνδρ' εἰθισμένον | ἀκόλαστον ἦθος γαστρὸς, ἐν τ' αὐτῷ μένει, hac sententia: LIGAT sive VINCIT (δεῖ = πεδᾶ) enim virum solita ventris intemperantia, nec eum relinquit . . . Translata notione eodem verbo δεῖν poeta usus est Hippol. 160, λῦπα εὐναία δέδεται ψυχά. Verba autem εἰθισμένον ἀκόλαστον ἦθος commode interpretari licet: ἡ εἰθισμένη ἀκολασία." Attention is called to the fact that Fragm. 385, which describes the letters which compose the name Θεσεύς, shows that "qua aetate Euripides THESEUM docuerit, litteram Ionicam H iam usu receptam fuisse; quapropter eam fabulam non inter antiquissima eius dramata numerandam esse suspicor." On Hom. Od. σ 171, ἀλλ' ἴθι καὶ σὺ παιδὶ ἔπος φάο μηδ' ἐπὶ κενθε, H. remarks that this line violates the constant usage by which ἴθι is followed by another imperative "nulla intercedente copula"; and he therefore proposes to read νῦν for καί: "genuinae lectionis leve vestigium servavit multorum codicum lectio NAI pro KAI."

In pp. 319-336 Herwerden continues his notes on Plato's Republic, Books VI-X. These are all interesting and instructive, but in hardly any case contain anything which apart from the immediate context can be made intelligible. One or two examples, however, may be quoted. P. 485e: Σώφρων μὴν ὁ γε τοιοῦτος (scil. philosophus) καὶ οὐδαμῇ φιλοχρήματος · ὦν γὰρ ἐνεκα χρήματα μετὰ πολλῆς δαπάνης σπουδάζεται, ἀλλῶ τινὲ μᾶλλον ἢ τούτῳ προσήκει σπουδάζειν. "Plato δαπάνη per brevilloquentiam usurpasse videtur pro ἡ τοῦ δαπανᾶν ἐπιθυμία. Fidem faciet locus Aeschinis in Ctesiphontea §218: τὴν δ' ἐμὴν σιωπὴν, ὧ Δημόσθενες, ἡ τοῦ βίου μετρίότης παρεσκεύασεν· ἀρκεῖ γάρ μοι μικρὰ καὶ μειζόνων αἰσχροῦς οὐκ ἐπιθυμῶ, ὥστε καὶ σιγῶ καὶ λέγω βουλευσάμενος, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀναγκαζόμενος ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν τῇ φύσει ΔΑΠΑΝΗΣ. σὺ δ' οἶμαι λαβὼν μὲν σεσίγηκας, ἀναλώσας δὲ

κέκραγας." 527c: ὡς οἶόν τ' ἄρα, ἣν δ' ἐγώ, μάλιστα προστακτέον, ὅπως οἱ ἐν τῇ καλλιπόμεναι σοι μηδὲν τρόπῳ γεωμετρίας ἀφέξονται. "In vetusto scriptore, qualis est Plato, non magis ferri posse videtur Καλλιπόλις pro καλῇ πόλις quam Μεγαλόπολις pro μεγάλη πόλις, Νεόπολις pro νέα πόλις, quae sequiorum demum usu terebantur, qua de re saepe admonuit Cobet. Correxerim igitur οἱ ἐν τῇ καλῇ πόλει, nisi forte acquiescendum antiquae vulgatae οἱ ἐν τῇ καλλίστῃ πόλει." P. 607c: "Inter poetarum dicteria contra philosophos recensetur ὁ τῶν Δία σοφῶν ὄχλος κρατῶν, quam lectionem primus Bekkerus recepit e Parisiensi A pro vulgata διασόφων, quod sane Graecum non est vocabulum. Multum tamen dubito num vel poetae dicere licuerit Δία pro περὶ Δία σοφός, ut taceam philosophos plus curare τὸν θεόν s. τὸ θεῖον, quam peculiarem aliquem deum. Quibus de causis conicio veram lectionem esse ΔΙΑ, i. e. ὁ τῶν λίαν σοφῶν ὄχλος κρατῶν, quae tragici poetici esse possunt sic disposita: ὁ τῶν λίαν σοφῶν | ὄχλος κρατῶν. Cf. Eurip. Hipp. 518, Med. 305.

C. D. MORRIS.

ANGLIA. Zeitschrift für englische Philologie. Herausgegeben von R. P. WÜLCKER und M. TRAUTMANN. VII Band. Halle, 1884.

George E. McLean continues from VI 4 his dissertation on Aelfric's Version of Alcuini Interrogationes Sigeuulfi in Genesin, with the A. S. and Latin texts on opposite pages, various readings being given at foot of page, and a lithographic facsimile of a few lines from each of five A. S. MSS accompanying the article.

F. Ludorff treats William Forrest's Theophiluslegende. Theophilus was in the service of a bishop, but lost his place on the bishop's death, gave up the faith, and, with the aid of a Jewish sorcerer, sold his soul to the devil in order to recover his position. Owing to the intercessory prayer of the Virgin Mary, he was restored to the favor of God, and his written contract with the devil was returned to him. Ludorff makes an enumeration of the different versions, from which it appears that the legend is Greek in its origin, and is traced to one Eutychianus. There are various Latin versions, the earliest in prose being that of Paulus Diaconus of Naples, and the earliest in metre that of the nun Hroswitha, noted in the history of the drama. There are also versions in French, High German, Low German, Netherlandish, Icelandic, and at least five English versions, one of which may be found in Horstmann's Altenglische Legenden (1874), and two in Kölbing's Englische Studien (I, 1877). This version of William Forrest, once chaplain to Queen Mary, was completed, as he states, Oct. 27, 1572. Ludorff gives a brief account of Forrest, after Warton, a history of the Theophilussaga in the West, with the relation of Forrest's version to the others, some remarks on it as a controversial writing, a few general remarks on the text, and the text itself, consisting of 1255 lines in 179 stanzas, all but one riming as in Troilus-verse, but the lines are by no means perfect iambic pentameters, and the versification is accentual rather than syllabic. The following stanza (114) from the prayer of Theophilus to the Virgin shows it at its best:

"Woworth this worldes false glytteringe glorye!
 Woworth hys honors that syn doth entyce!
 Woworth, in hym are thowsandis so sorye!
 Woworth then all his pleasures and delyce!
 Woworth no better is all his devyce!
 Woworth the tyme I spent my tyme therin!
 Woworth wherbye I fallen am in syn!"

The last section contains some very brief grammatical and syntactical remarks, which show a singular error for a German scholar, a confusion of the verbal noun in *-ing* with the participle in *-ing*, which is a common blunder of English grammarians, but not of Germans. There are also misprints in the references.

L. Proescholdt furnishes Eine prosaische Nachbildung der 'Erzählung des Müllers' aus Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, from a rare book in the British Museum entitled 'The Life and Death of the Merry Deuill of Edmonton. With the pleasant prancks of Smug the Smith, etc., 1631', which, however, we might well have dispensed with.

S. Levy finds Eine neue Quelle zu Shakespeare's *Cymbeline*—besides Holinshed and the ninth tale of the second day in Boccaccio's *Decameron*—the eighth tale, and argues briefly for the addition of this source to those already recognized. (See *Anglia* VI.)

F. G. Fleay writes an interesting essay in English on Davenant's *Macbeth* and Shakespeare's *Witches*. Davenant's play, with alterations, etc., was published in 1674, and contained two "new songs" first printed in the edition of *Macbeth* of 1673, which was otherwise merely a reprint of the First Folio text. Other songs and all the Hecate speeches are attributed by Fleay to Middleton, and he shows "that Middleton's Witch is far more a copy of Jonson's *Masque of Queens* than it is of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*." Further, Shakspeare's "Weird Sisters" are the three Norns, or Fates, and his giving them up for the real witches was in compliment to the views of James I on Demonology. Again, after the fire at the Globe in 1613, which is thought to have destroyed many of Shakspeare's MSS, Middleton altered the play, as Clark and Wright have conjectured, "by inserting songs and dances, and music and shows." "Following Middleton's lead, in 1673, some person unknown introduced two songs additional, and in 1674 Davenant ruthlessly mangled the whole." I cannot give the arguments in detail, but it is an interesting subject, and is treated in an interesting manner.

J. Zupitza contributes twenty critical notes on Havelok; and a collection of examples of what he calls *Der Accusativus Qualitatis im heutigen Englisch*, unnoticed by the grammarians. They are, however, explicable by the ellipsis of a preposition, and supply simply one more illustration of the numerous ellipses in colloquial English.

E. Hausknecht opposes briefly, in his article *Zur Fierabrasdichtung in England*, the view of Francisque Michel that the romance of *Fierabras* mentioned in Barbour's *Bruce* was the same as that epitomized by Ellis and published by the E. E. T. Society (1881) as the *Sowdone of Babylone*. He concludes that Barbour's version does not agree with any one of the existing versions.

O. Goldberg reprints from his dissertation, in which it was published for the first time, *Ein Englischer Cato*, a poem of 644 lines, written in four-line stanzas, and contained in two MSS of the second half of the 14th century, the Vernon MS at Oxford being the best, of which the MS in the British Museum is a copy. Both contain the Latin, French and English versions.

A. Leicht has another article, *Zur Angelsächsischen Bearbeitung des Boethius*, in continuation of the view previously expressed (*Anglia* VI 126), that the A. S. version of the *Metres* of Boethius was not written by King Alfred. This article treats at length the relation of the A. S. prose translation of Boethius to the Latin work, which translation is by common consent ascribed to King Alfred.

B. W. Wells contributes a valuable paper on the Development of Old English Long Vowels, its purpose being "to show what sounds and what letters now represent the O. E. long vowels and long diphthongs." This is done by giving under each long vowel and diphthong the O. E. (A. S.) word and its corresponding N. E. word. The general correspondences are readily traced, but there are so many exceptions, some of which are unexplained, that it seems impossible to assign valid phonetic reasons for *all* the apparently arbitrary changes in English vowel sounds. They do not always follow the expected development, and while the presence of certain consonants explains many such exceptions, this will not always answer, and even analogy fails to justify them. Fourteen signs, "adopted from Brücke's *Lautphysiologie*," are used to denote the N. E. sounds, but the analysis seems scarcely exact enough. σ is used to denote the vowel sounds in *sore* and in *raw*, also in *roar* and in *broad*; if it suffices for *sore* and *roar*, it will not answer for *raw* and *broad*. This leads to the classification of *forty* along with *four*, *fourth* and *fourteen*, as having the same vowel sound in N. E. Also *swore* and *brought* are similarly denoted. So σ is used for the vowel sound in *wet*, *breath*, and for that in *hair*, *there*. The sounds \acute{u} (*good*) and σ (*were* and *but*) appear to be confused, for the former is applied to the sound of \acute{u} in *hung* (p. 206); and under O. E. \bar{u} , N. E. *au* (*thou*), it is stated (p. 215), "In monosyllables the sound *au* is regular, but it . . . always is shortened to \acute{u} before *m*, *f*, *c*"; whereas on p. 216 we find, "In dissyllables and in monosyllables before *m*, *f* (*v*), *c*, and also in *but*, *shun*, *us*, we have σ ," as in *scum*, showing that we should read σ for \acute{u} on p. 215. Again, \acute{u} (*tooth*) is used to represent both \acute{u} and \acute{y} for O. E. \bar{e} and \bar{o} before *w*, as (p. 207) *few* and *shrew*, to which add *flew* (O. E. $\bar{f$ leah), and p. 208, *yew* (O. E. \bar{e} ow), *blew*, *ewe* (O. E. \bar{e} owe), and *new*. In all these words \acute{y} is the older sound, still retained except after the liquids *l* and *r*, and certain spirants, for though we may hear in some parts of this country *nu* for *new*, as has been remarked—by Dean Alford, if I recollect aright—nobody says *fu* for *few*. Also *yew* and *ewe* are indistinguishable in pronunciation, while representing the same O. E. diphthong, a further reason for taking account of the sound \acute{y} ; and to complete the development we might add the country farmer's sound of the latter, $\acute{y}o$. The article is a valuable contribution to the history of English sounds.

F. H. Stratmann prints, after a new collation, *Eine englische Urkunde* von 1155, from Cart. Harl. 111, B. 49, in the British Museum.

E. Sievers closes this number with an *Erklärung gegen Herrn J. Platt*, which explains itself.

2. The contents of the first part of the Anzeiger to this volume may be briefly summed up :

F. H. Stratmann notices A New English Dictionary, edited by J. A. H. Murray, LL. D., Part I, A-Ant (1884); E. Einenkel, Georg Peele, Untersuchungen über sein Leben und seine Werke, von Dr. R. Lämmerhirt (1882); Zur Dialektbestimmung des M. E. Sir Firumbras, von Dr. B. Carstens (1884); and Sir Gowther, Eine englische Romanze aus dem XV Jahrhundert, Inauguraldissertation von K. Breul (1883); E. Holthaus, Wulfstan, herausgegeben von A. Napier; I. Texte und varianten (1883); R. P. Wülcker, The Promus of Formularies and Elegancies by Francis Bacon, illustrated and elucidated by passages from Shakespeare by Mrs. Henry Pott (1883). Wülcker's point of view may be seen from the following (p. 21): "Doch dies genüge zu zeigen, welch bodenloser sinn, gegründet auf die ärgste verdrehung der gut beglaubigten tatsachen, der nachlässigsten beweisführung und der ärgsten unwissenheit, in diesem buche enthalten ist!" J. Koch notices A Short Sketch of English Literature from Chaucer to the Present Time, Compiled from English Sources by El. Mann (1883); and Geoffrey Chaucer, The Hous of Fame, Berliner dissertation of Hans Willert (1883); E. Förster, J. Schürmann's Darstellung der Syntax in Cynewulf's Elene, Münstersche dissertation (1884); L. Morsbach, S. Editha sive Chronicon Vilodunense im Wiltshire Dialekt, herausg. von C. Horstmann (1883); and Die praktische Spracherlernung auf Grund der Psychologie und der Physiologie der Sprache, dargestellt von F. Franke (1884); U. Zernial, Die Hauptregeln der englischen Formenlehre und Syntax, von Dr. O. Ritter (1883); M. Trautmann, J. Zupitza's edition of the Beowulf Autotypes, published by the E. E. T. Society (1882); and Die Sprachlaute im allgemeinen und die Laute des Englischen, Französischen und Deutschen im besonderen, von M. Trautmann, 1 hälfte (1884), merely descriptive.

Under *Verschiedenes* we have the following essays, comprising three-fifths of the number, the first alone being forty pages in length: Zur Geschichte der englischen Gaumenlaute, by E. Förster; Zu Chaucer's Erzählung des Müllers, by H. Varnhagen; Ein mitttelenglisches Gedicht seltener Form, and Zum mitttelenglischen Konsonantismus, by the same; Zu Byron's Prisoner of Chillon und Macaulay's History of England, I, Ch. III, by D. Asher, and Das Vorbild Swift's zu seinem Gulliver, by the same; and Orm's Doppelkonsonanten, by M. Trautmann, a very important article, for it advances a new theory as to this peculiarity of Orm's spelling. Scholars have heretofore thought that Orm doubled his consonants *because* the preceding *vowel* was *short*, though some remarkable exceptions to this principle have been noted. Trautmann has investigated the subject carefully and comes to the conclusion (p. 98): "Orm schreibt nicht einfachen konsonanten um länge, und nicht doppelten um kürze des vorhergehenden vokals auszudrücken, sondern er schreibt auf grund des gesetzes: 'Konsonantischer silbenauslaut ist kurz nach langem, und lang nach kurzem vokal';" so Orm's double consonants mean that the *consonant* itself is *long*, the consonant which closes a syllable being *short* after a long vowel and hence written single, and *long* after a short vowel and hence written double. This is an important phonetic discovery, and it must be acknowledged that Trautmann presents good grounds for his view.

(For a further treatment of this subject see below.) M. Trautmann adds a short article on the etymology of the word "Amulet"; and L. Morsbach closes the *Anzeiger* with an *Erwiderung* to D. Asher on the reading "*joined*" for "*pined*" in Byron's *Prisoner of Chillon*, "*Fettered in hand, but joined (pined) in heart*," defending the former, and in the next number of *Anglia* Asher acknowledges the correctness of "*joined*." The essays of the *Anzeiger* have exceeded the book notices.

3. F. G. Fleay opens the third number with an article in English on Shakespeare and Puritanism. He dismisses lightly the few allusions in *Twelfth Night*, *Winter's Tale*, and *All's Well*, but as Lily, Greene, Nash and others had assailed the Martin Marprelate writers, and Greene and Nash were at this time (1589-90) enemies of Shakspeare, he finds in Love's *Labor's Lost* a satire on the opponents of the Puritan party, hence Shakspeare "could not consistently lend his pen to the advocacy of the other side." Fleay's conclusion is "that Shakespeare, naturally disinclined to introduce questions of religious or even ecclesiastical controversy on the stage, is singularly unlike his contemporaries in this abstinence from satirizing the Puritans."

J. A. Harrison contributes an interesting study of Negro English, arranged under Phonetics and the several Parts of Speech, and closing with some twenty pages of Specimen Negroisms, for help in forming which collection he acknowledges indebtedness to the works of J. C. Harris, J. A. Macon, Sherwood Bonner and others. While familiar enough to Southerners in this country, many of these linguistic phenomena will, doubtless, be new to Germans; but in stating (p. 234) that some of these pronunciations "are common enough all over the South among white and black alike," the writer should have limited them to uneducated whites. Some misprints have been noticed.

H. Varnhagen, under the title, *Die kleineren Gedichte der Vernon- und Simeon-Handschrift*, publishes the text of certain minor Middle English poems, in great part heretofore unpublished, or insufficiently published. There are thirty-one of them all together, of which thirteen are given in this number and the rest will follow, with the exception of three already satisfactorily published. The text follows the Vernon MS, with variations from Simeon.

Miss L. T. Smith prints for the first time the text of *Abraham and Isaac*, A Mystery Play, from a private manuscript of the 15th century. This is the Brome MS, dating from A. D. 1499, and belonging to the county of Suffolk, and this play is the first example of early English drama found in East Anglia. It forms the sixth play on the subject of Abraham's sacrifice, no two being alike; the others are contained in the well-known *Chester*, *Towneley* and *Coventry Mysteries*, in the new *York Plays*, from the *Ashburnham MS*—edited by Miss L. T. Smith and just issued from the Clarendon Press—and in a *Trinity College, Dublin MS*, printed by J. P. Collier in 1836, in only twenty-five copies. Miss Smith compares briefly each of these plays with the present one, from which it appears that this is the longest, being 466 lines. It is written in stanzas usually of five or eight lines, though the versification varies. The text is given in full, and it is a valuable addition to our existing collections of 15th century Mysteries. The language deserves careful study for the

development of the East Midland dialect, and certain peculiarities need explanation, as *hydygth* = hide it, *fyndygth* = find it, *smygth* = smite, though *smyth* is also found.

L. Proescholdt supplies Randkorrekturen zur Cambridge- und Globe-Ausgabe der Shakespeare'schen Werke, which are to be continued.

A. Diebler, under the title Faust- und Wagner-Pantomimen in England, gives specimens of these farces which prevailed in Drury Lane and Covent Garden theatres during the early 18th century, as we learn from Pope's Dunciad, 233 ff., and Pope's note on the passage, written in 1729. He prints from Harlequin Doctor Faustus, and from the Miser; or Wagner and Abericock, both composed by John Thurmond, Dancing-master, and published, the former in 1724, and the latter in 1727.

O. Hofer contributes Der syntaktische Gebrauch des Dativs und Instrumentals in den Caedmon beigelegten Dichtungen, a very thorough study of the use of these cases in Caedmon. The present article consists of two sections, one on the dative proper considered in its different relations, with verbs, the reflexive dative, with adjectives and adverbs, with substantives, with the comparative, and the dative absolute; the other treats similarly the instrumental, considering the A. S. dative-instrumental as corresponding to an older instrumental, under the instrumental of accompaniment, of means, of cause, of manner, and to an older ablative, to an older locative, in relations of time, and lastly with adjectives. A third section will follow treating these cases with prepositions. No attempt is made to separate the genuine from the spurious poems of the so-called Caedmon. The collection of examples, chiefly from the Genesis, is very complete, and it is only by such studies that Anglo-Saxon syntax can be settled on a firm basis.

E. O. Stiehler prints the beginning and the end of each of thirty-five Altenglische Legenden of the 14th century, from the Stowe MS 669 in the British Museum. He describes the MS, correcting in some particulars the account of it given in the Stowe Catalogue (1849), and announces his intention of soon publishing in Anglia all of these legends.

M. F. Mahn treats at length Der Physiologus des Philipp von Thaün und seine Quellen, in two sections, the first discussing the Life and Works of Philipp von Thaün with special reference to his Physiologus, and the second the Sources of his Physiologus, both in general and in particular. Philip de Than was the first Norman poet of England and wrote under Henry I. Besides the Physiologus or Bestiary, he wrote the Computus or Calendar, both edited by Wright, but the latter in a much better text by Mall (Strasburg, 1873). The Bestiary is contained in two MSS, one in the British Museum and the other in the Royal Library at Copenhagen, both of which are discussed in full by Mahn. From a study of the sources he finds (p. 443) that Philip must have translated a Latin Physiologus, which contained all the animals and stones treated by him, and even in the same order, but we do not know the particular one used by him. In treating the particular sources among the various Latin versions, he finds that Philip sometimes follows a source verbatim, at others with scarcely any agreement. He considers *nine* animals, and the article will presumably be continued.

E. Hönncher, in *Studien zur angelsächsischen Genesis*, investigates the interpolation of verses 235-851, designated as B, basing his studies on Sievers's pamphlet "*Der Heliand und die angelsächsische Genesis*" (1875). He first states Sievers's arguments, and then examines carefully every word and passage adduced by Sievers as showing an imitation or even a reminiscence of the Old Saxon. The actual coincidences are much reduced by this examination, many words and expressions being found elsewhere in A. S. poetry, and others being formed by analogy from A. S. words in current use. After this careful study he inclines to ten Brink's view that an Old-Saxon who had come to England was the author of this passage, especially as he makes use of Germanic words that do not occur in the *Heliand*, a list of which is given. The results are summed up as follows (p. 496): The passage is acknowledged to be an interpolation on the ground of its language (not its contents), which shows Old-Saxon peculiarities. Any connection between its author and the author of the *Heliand* is absolutely rejected, for the linguistic peculiarities can be explained on the theory above-mentioned. The author used native constructions, and even words, that had no direct correspondences in Anglo-Saxon, and formed new words conformably to the genius of the Anglo-Saxon language. We have no reason to suppose that he had the *Heliand* before him, though a knowledge of it on his part is probable. Hönncher promises a second essay on the Sources of the A. S. *Genesis*, which has since appeared in *Anglia* VIII 1.

B. Leonhardt, *Zu Cymbeline*, replies to S. Levy's criticism (*Anglia* VII 120) of his essay, '*Ueber die Quellen zu Shakespeare's Cymbeline*,' and gives his reasons for not agreeing with Levy's view mentioned above.

R. Wülcker writes a very appreciative notice of the young philologist Theodore Wissman, who died July 7, 1883, in his thirtieth year, and who had already become known to students of English philology from his studies of *King Horn* and his valuable edition of that Middle English poem of the late thirteenth century.

Under *Nachträge und Berichtigungen*, B. Leonhardt quotes from Drake's *Shakespeare and his Time* on the character of Cloten as a note *Zu Leonhardt's Aufsatz über Cymbeline*, s. 497 ff.; and D. Asher, *Zu Anglia*, VII, s. 91 und s. 101, acknowledges the correctness of Morsbach's reading "*joined*" instead of "*pined*" in the line from Byron's *Prisoner of Chillon*:

"Fettered in hand, but joined in heart."

4. It must suffice merely to note the contents of the second part of the *Anzeiger* to this volume. Miss L. T. Smith reviews Ward's *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*, Vol. I, 1883, and the *Catalogue of Books in the Library of the British Museum printed in England, Scotland and Ireland, and of Books in English printed abroad, to the year 1640*, 3 vols., 1884; also the *Gentleman's Magazine Library*, Vol. II, *Dialect, Proverbs, and Word-Lore*, 1884; and Jusserand's *La vie nomade et les routes d'Angleterre au XIV siècle*, n. d. E. Einkenkel notices Scholle's *Laurence Minot's Lieder mit grammatisch-metrisch Einleitung, Quellen und Forschungen*, 52, 1884; L. Proescholdt, *Elze's Notes on Elizabethan Dramatists, with Conjectural Emendations of the Text*, second series, 1884; E. Holthaus, *Prehn's Komposition und Quellen des Exeterbuches*, 1883, and D'Ham's *Der gegen-*

wärtige Stand der Cynewulffrage, 1883, both dissertations; R. Wülcker, *Wie studiert man neuere philologie und germanistik?* Anonymous, 1884; Turner's *Die englische Sprache*, n. d.—an ignorant and worthless book, as Wülcker shows, and I have found out to my cost; Wülcker's *Grundriss zur angelsächsischen Litteraturgeschichte*, 1 hälfte, 1884, which may be warmly commended to all *Fachgenossen*, and ten Brink's *Chaucer's Sprache und Verskunst*, 1884, also a boon to English scholars; J. Koch, Varnhagen's *Longfellow's Tales of a Wayside Inn und ihre Quellen*, 1884; and M. Trautmann, Schipper's *William Dunbar*, 1884, which is highly praised; and Cosijn's *Altwestsächsische Grammatik*, Erste hälfte, 1883, which treats only the vowels of stem-syllables as seen in the *Chronicle*, the *Cura Pastoralis*, and the *Orosius*.

Under *Verschiedenes* we have several short essays. J. Zupitza contributes two, *Zur Lehre vom Gebrauch des Neuenglischen Conditionals*, and *Etymologie von Neuengl. Loose*. H. Varnhagen writes *Zu Chaucer's Erzählung des Kaufmanns*. H. Effer supplies the main essay in this part, *Einfache und Doppelte Konsonanten im Ormulum*, fully agreeing with Trautmann (*Anglia*, VII, Anz. 94), though having undertaken the investigation in order to combat his views. E. Einkenkel prints Wulfstan's Homily, *Der Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* ein Gedicht, metrically, in order to show its correspondence to the verse of Otfrid. H. Willert, *Zum Handschriftenverhältniss des Hous of Fame*, combats the views of Koch (*Anglia*, VII, Anz. 24), and Koch briefly replies. M. Trautmann discusses *Noch einmal Orm's Doppelkonsonanten*, and writes *Zum 89 Rätsel*, and *Otfrid in England*; he closes the *Anzeiger* with a brief obituary notice of the distinguished English scholar F. H. Stratmann, who died Nov. 9, 1884, in his sixty-third year, and who is so well known to English scholars from his invaluable *Dictionary of the Old English Language*, now in its third edition, his editions of the *Owl and Nightingale*, of *Hamlet*, and other works. He left nearly finished a *Short Middle-English Grammar*, which will be soon published by Morsbach. Stratmann's name is familiar to the readers of *Anglia* and *Englische Studien*, and all scholars who have had occasion to use his *Old-English Dictionary* can appreciate this first attempt to supply a lexicon for the literature of the XII-XVth centuries. While omissions of words may be found, it is still indispensable to the student of English of this period, for there is nothing to take its place, and it will remain so until the completion of Dr. Murray's *New English Dictionary of the Philological Society*, the end of which, at present rate of progress, few now living will see. I concur heartily in Trautmann's worthy tribute to the memory of Stratmann.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM.

XXXVIII, 1.

1. pp. 1-27. F. Leo. *Epistula Plautina*. Observations upon the language of Plautus, illustrated by collections and emendations. As he has done before in papers upon other poets, so here again L. shows how much may sometimes be accomplished by the simple means of judicious punctuation. A note is given to the noun *divus*, which appears to have been displaced from many passages. There is an elaborate account of the forms of *ipse*. The

genitive plural *ipsorum, ipsarum*, was unknown to the earlier Latinity, and seems not to occur in the literature before Virgil. The forms *eorumpse, earumpse*, are to be restored to the text of Plautus in several passages. That the nominatives *ipse* and *supse* were once used indifferently seems to be proved by glosses in Festus, whence it appears that *ipsilles, ipsullices*, and *subsilles* or *supsilles* were all names of the same thing—*bractee in virilem muliebremque speciem expressae*, further defined as *quaedam lamellae sacrificiis necessariae*. That is to say, they were objects intended to represent, to serve as substitutes for, the actual persons of men and women in the sacrificial offering. A frequent source of corruption in Plautus has been the intolerance of asyndeton on the part of scribes and others. The combination *inde exilico* is preserved in the MSS in the prologue of the Mercator, 17, and is to be restored in several other passages. Except in combination with *inde* or *hinc*, *exilico* is not found. The use of the preposition in this compound is to be compared rather with what we have in *exadversum* and the like than with *exinde*, since *ilico* does not contain an ablative notion, while *inde* does. L. regards *ilico* itself as a compound of which the first part is the locative case of the pronoun *is*. The word *exillim*, which is to be restored in a couple of passages, is related to *illim* as *exhinc* to *hinc*. A verb everywhere much exposed to corruption is *bito*, with its compounds. The principal corrections proposed by L. are the following: Plaut. Amph. 635, *ita divis est placitum, voluptatem ut maeror comes consequatur*. Asin. 130, *nam iam inde exilico | ibo*. Aulul. 709, *plenam : iam inde exilico | video recipere se senem*. Capt. 508, *inde exilico praevortor*. 519, *neque exillim exitiost neque adeo spes quae hunc mi aspellat metum*. 672, *dilaceravisti deartuavisti probe*. Cist. II 1, 4, *iactor crucior agitor stimulor | vorsor in Amoris rota, exanimor, | feror differor distrahor diripior, | ita nubila mente animi habeo : | ubi sum ibi non sum, ubi non sum ibist animus, | ita mi omnia sunt ingenia. | quod lubet, non lubet iam id continuo, | ita me Amor lassum animi ludificat, | fugat agitat petit raptat retinet, | laciat largitur, dat non dat, | modo quod suavit id dissuadet, | quod dissuasit id ostentat*. Bacch. 760, *fuginus*. Chr., *vos vestrum curate officium, ego ecsciam meum*. Most. 139, *haec verecundiam mi et virtutis modum | deturbavit detexitque me ilico : postilla optigere me negligens fui*. Men. 217, *divom divitiis*. Mil. 186, *earumpse artem et disciplinam obtineat colere*. 360, *patibulum quom subbites*. 997, *domo si bitat, dum huc transbitat quae huius cupiens corporist*. 1207, *exillim ego te liberabo*. 1242, *prohibendam mortem mulieri video—adbitone ? minime*. 1381, *me quaerit : ilico hinc i bo huic puero obviam*. Merc. 16, *sed hoc parum hercle more amatorum institi : rem eampse ecscatus sum orsusque inde exilico*. Rud. 859, *ego hunc scelestum in ius rapiam hinc exilico*. 1226, *ita meas replevit auris, quidquid memorabam, "licet"*. 1229, *si sapias, habeas quod danunt divi boni*. Trin. 1049, *qui nil meriti, quippe eorumpse ingenio ingenium horum probant*. Truc. 259, *sat mihi : tuae salutis nil moror : sat salveo*. 307, *quisquam homo mortalis dinarum posthac rerum creduit*. 331, *di me perduint si te revocavi : non tibi dicebam "i" modo ?* 443, *iam inde exilico | iubebo*. 710, *quia nil habeo unde animum moveam dominae, agam precario*. 713, *nunc cum isti lubet, dum habet, tempust ei rei. | sed cunctam prome venustatem tuam amanti, ut gaudeat cum perdis*. 751, *A. bene vale. D. resiste. A. omitte. D. sine bitam intro. A. ad te quidem. | D. immo istoc ad vos. licetne ? A. non potest, nimum petis*. 886, *propter hunc spes etiamst hodie inanitum iri militem*. Ter. Hec. 163, *ad exemplum*

ambarum mores earumpse aestimans. In a final remark L. notes that *impurate*, Aul. 359, is an obvious pun upon the Greek word for fire. That same word Bücheler has recognized in the Umbrian dialect. But Plautus did not put Umbrian into his plays: this pun must have been intelligible to the Romans; "vestigia igitur aliqua vocis Italis Graecisque communis apud Romanos quoque extitisse videntur."

2. pp. 28-91. P. Natorp. Researches concerning Ancient Scepticism. This long paper deals with Ainesidemos, discussing chiefly the obscure question of the relations between his doctrine and the teachings of Herakleitos. The conclusion is, in brief, that although Ainesidemos was a true sceptic in his denial of the admissibility of any form of philosophical dogma as a statement of truth, still he did admit, not only the practical importance of probability as to the phenomena in every-day life, but also the possibility of profitable search after probability in philosophical speculation. And as a philosophical probability he esteemed and taught the system of Herakleitos. N. regards it as most probable that Ainesidemos taught in the first half of the first century B. C.

3. pp. 92-96. E. Westerburg. Petronius and Lucan. That the poem of Petronius, *De Bello Civili*, was intended to belittle the merit of Lucan's performance is well known; but it is a mistake to suppose that Petronius intended to show by an example how the subject could be better treated. He attempted rather a travesty of Lucan, with frequent parodies of tempting passages. But Lucan is not the only person laughed at. The critics of Lucan found that he had committed a grave fault in omitting the usual mythological machinery of epic delineation. Petronius makes sport of this sort of criticism by using mythological machinery in the manner of an extravaganza. W. thinks Petronius wrote his poem a year or two before the death of Lucan. To be sure, only three books were published by Lucan in his lifetime, while Petronius makes obvious allusions to the seventh book. But, aside from the first three, the seventh is the only book of Lucan which Petronius seems to know; and there are good reasons for supposing that he knew this book from a public recitation by its author.

4. pp. 97-119. P. Wolters. *De Constantini Cephalae Anthologia*. The conclusion is that the collection of Kephala contained Anth. Pal. IV-XII and nothing else.

5. pp. 120-125. F. Heerdegen. Notes on Cicero's Orator. Among the MSS which contain the whole of the Orator, H. has carefully examined two copies, the Magliabecchianus, I 1, 14, and the Ottobonianus 2057, which seem better representatives of their class than those hitherto used by the editors. Both appear to be direct copies of the lost Laudensis. In the case of the Magliabecchianus, this is inferred principally from the character of the mistakes made by the copyist, who must have had before him just such a MS as the Laudensis was—old and hard to decipher. The Ottobonianus gives us the direct testimony of its own subscription that it was copied directly from the Laudensis, and that the copy was revised by a corrector who had the same original before him. H. quotes the readings of a number of passages so selected as to show the importance of the two manuscripts in question for a new revision of the text.

6. pp. 126-131. L. Mendelssohn. Various Readings in Dionysios of Halikarnassos and Appian. From the codex Peirescianus in Tours.

7. pp. 132-156. Miscellany. F. B(ücheler), in the course of a page of Coniectanea, translates *Revue de Philologie* into *philologiae epoptisis*, which seems a new invention. He also gives a new specimen of his wonderful skill in divination, writing Lucil. Fr. 339 (Lachmann) thus: *vñ τὸν in arce bovem, descripsi magnifice, inquit.* The Juvenal scholia published in the *Revue de Phil.* VI, B. thinks of the very slightest worth.

A. Ludwig proposes several corrections for the text of the *Eumenides*. V. 68 (Kirchhoff), ὑπὸν·'ξισοῦνται δ' αἱ κατάπτυστοι κόραι | γραιαίς, κτλ. V. 209, τίτας γυναικὸς ἦτις ἄνδρα νοσφίση. V. 211, παρ' οὐδὲν ἐρρέτω. He also presents an arrangement of the difficult passage vv. 251 ff., "wie sie nach meiner Ansicht ursprünglich ungefähr könnte gelautet haben."

N. Wecklein's half dozen corrections of the fragments of Sophokles include the following, which seem the most interesting: Fr. 140 (Nauck), κἀντίπαιδα τὴν παρηίδα. Fr. 152 should be printed μάσθλητας τομούς, the passage in Hesychius from which it comes being thus restored: μάσθλητας τομούς· τὰς ἡνίας. καὶ γὰρ ὁ μάσθλης καὶ ἡ μάσθλη. Σοφοκλῆς 'Ανδρομέδα καὶ Σινδείπνοις. Fr. 593, 5, πλᾶθεισα δ' ἐν λειμῶνι ποταμίων ποτῶν | ἰδὼν σκυῖας εἰδῶλον ἀγασθεῖσ' ὕδωρ.

M. Schanz calls attention to a passage from Tatian's oration against the Greeks (c. 25, p. 102, Otto) treated by Bernays, in his tract upon Lucian and the Cynics. This passage, containing a quotation from the Cynic Peregrinus, or, as he called himself later, Proteus, reads as follows: τί μέγα καὶ θαυμαστόν οἱ παρ' ἡμῖν ἐργάζονται φιλόσοφοι; θατέρον γὰρ τῶν ὤμων ἐξαμελοῦσι, κόμην ἐπιειμένοι πολλήν, πωγωνοτροφοῦσιν, δνυχας θηρίων περιφέροντες καὶ λέγοντες μὲν δεῖσθαι μηδενός, κατὰ δὲ τὸν Πρωτέα σκυτοδέψου μὲν χρῆζοντες διὰ τὴν πῆραν, ὑφάντων δὲ διὰ τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ διὰ τὸ ξύλον ὀρυτοτόμον, διὰ δὲ τὴν γαστριμαργίαν τῶν πλουτούντων καὶ ὀψοποιῶν. S. writes πλακούντων in place of πλουτούντων at the end, letting it depend upon γαστριμαργίαν. The clause about the γαστριμαργία is a distortion of the words used by Proteus, introduced by Tatian; Proteus here probably said simply that as the philosopher must have bread, so he stands in need of the baker's services. Tatian probably found his quotation from Proteus in that writer's ἐγκώμιον τῆς Πενίας, referred to by the rhetor Menander. In Polybios, I 70, 3, S. proposes to write Μάθω τὸν στρατηγὸν ἀπαίρειν ἐκέλευεν. Several notes on the text of Aeschines and Lucian follow.

J. M. Stahl objects to certain conclusions reached by Holzapfel in his article on Thucydides's account of the treatment of the Mytileneans, R. M. XXXVII 448 ff. He argues that there is no reason whatever for supposing words to have been lost from the text of Thucydides in the statement of the confiscation at Lesbos. If the income from the confiscated land was small, that only shows that the severity practised by the Athenians was not excessive. And very probably all or nearly all the land in Lesbos was the property of the nobles, so that if Thucydides had said the confiscation was limited to the land of the nobles, he would only have said in substance what we read in our editions.

Fr. Reuss argues very neatly from the coincidences between the *Epitaphios* of Lysias and the *Panegyrikos* and *Areopagitikos* of Isocrates against the genuineness of the former.

G. Busolt has had the good fortune and the readiness of vision to find a sure indication of the period to which should be referred the attempt of Perikles to bring about a general congress of Greek states at which certain matters of national interest might be discussed. The story is told by Plutarch in the life of Perikles, c. 17. And in that passage, after the statement of the subjects proposed for discussion, follows a detail of which the importance has hitherto not been noticed: ἐπὶ ταῦτα δ' ἄνδρες εἰκοσι τῶν ὑπὲρ πεντήκοντα ἔτη γεγονότων ἐπέμψθησαν, ὧν πέντε μὲν Ἴωνας καὶ Δωριεῖς τοὺς ἐν Ἀσίᾳ καὶ νησιώτας ἄχρι Λέσβου καὶ Ῥόδου παρεκάλουν, πέντε δὲ τοὺς ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ καὶ Θρᾷκη μέχρι Βυζαντίου τόπους ἐπέμψαν, κτλ. B. has observed that the districts to which these two sets of commissioners were sent correspond closely to the official divisions of the Athenian Empire, and that the districts are named in that order which became the official order after 439 B. C., i. e. Ionians and Dorians, the islands, the Hellespont, Thrace, whereas before the revolt of Samos the order of arrangement in official lists was this: Ionia, the Hellespont, Thrace, Caria, the islands. And as it has already been remarked more than once that the passage in Plutarch seems to rest directly or indirectly upon an official report of the original Athenian decree, the conclusion seems clear that the matter is to be referred to the period following the revolt of Samos. The reason why the Lacedaemonians and their allies would not join in such a congress is plain enough: as each city was to have a vote, the Athenians with their allies would have been greatly in the majority.

K. Rossberg quotes a couple of pages of lines from Thiofrid's Life of Willibrord (ed. R. Decker, Wien, 1881) to show that the author was an eager imitator of Lucan.

A. Riese attempts an explanation of *quamquam* and *tamen*. He adopts an opinion stated by K. Schenkl, to the effect that *tamen* is a compound of *tam* with some word not yet discovered. For the relation of *quam*—*tam* he compares the similar use of *sic*—*ut*. He then seeks to use the fact that *quamde*, found in Lucretius, is an old Latin equivalent of the simple *quam*. Hence he infers that *quamde* and *tamen* are made up of *quam* + *inde* and *tam* + *inde* respectively, *inde* undergoing different mutilations in the different cases. This *inde*, which is to be understood to be entirely distinct from *indu*, *in*, he conceives to have had the meaning of *et*, so that a combination *quamde*—*tamen* would be equivalent to a conceivable *et quam*—*et tam*. But the editor, F. B., adds a foot-note expressing doubt. He thinks a comparison of Italic dialects indicates a different view of *quamde*. In his *Lexicon Italicum* Bücheler translates the Umbrian *postertio pane* by *post tertium quam*, and cites *quamde* to illustrate the formation and meaning of *pane*. Obviously then he regards the second part of *quamde* as nothing else than the common preposition *de*. As for *tamen*, in the present foot-note he expresses the opinion that it is nothing more than *in tam*, to that degree, in like measure.

XXXVIII, 2.

1. pp. 157-196. G. F. Unger. The *Κασσιεπίδες* and *Ἀλβίων*. The argument, which deals in geographical details too minute for a report, goes to show that the names in question have properly nothing to do with the British Islands, or any islands in British waters, but rather belong to islands much nearer Spain.

2. pp. 197-221. Th. Birt. Remarks on the "First Book" of Propertius. Intended as a supplement to the treatment of Propertius in the author's recent work, "Das antike Buchwesen." The view there taken is that Propertius published two collections of elegies, one collection containing those now contained in what is usually called the first book, and the other divided into four books. Of this second collection we have the last three books entire, but only a selected portion of the first. It is with this mutilated first book of the second collection that B. deals. Of it we have the poems II 1-9. Then B. searches for internal indications of the fact that they are only a selection from the book to which they belonged. He also urges the view that II 11 is out of its place, really belonging with the "First Book," and originally standing at the end of that book.

3. pp. 222-244. F. Hanssen. A Law of Musical Accent in the Quantitative Poetry of the Greeks. This article may be regarded as a complement of the same writer's paper on the Word-Ictus in Greek, published in the Rhein. Mus., XXXVII 252 ff., and reported in this Journal, V 117. "From the earliest time there was a tendency in Greek poetry, which steadily increased in force, to combine a transition from higher pitch (accent) to lower pitch with an ascending rhythm at the end of the verse and before the masculine caesura. The result of this tendency, of course, was to bring about not the concurrence of accent and verse-ictus, but rather discrepancy between these. In the sixth century after Christ begins to appear a strong tendency to unite accent and verse-ictus, at first only in descending rhythm at the end of the verse. The latter tendency affords a proof that the accent was beginning to change its character, to consist to some degree in emphasis." Thus H. The statement in regard to position of accent before masculine caesura does not seem to be very strongly borne out by the facts he cites, nor does he appear to make much of it. But his statistics touching the accent at the end of the pentameter verse in the elegiac distich are interesting. This is the brief summary: In general the final syllable of the first colon of the pentameter has an accent in 34 per cent. of the cases. At the end of the second colon the percentage is always smaller than this; in the early period it is 18 per cent.; in the Alexandrine period 12.6 per cent.; with conservative poets of the Roman period 10.3 per cent.; with more independent poets of the Roman period 2.3 per cent.; in the Byzantine period 1.36 per cent. Without quoting all H.'s figures for the iambic trimeter, it may suffice to say that in all poets down to the end of the Alexandrine period the closing syllable is accented in about 30 per cent. of the verses. The percentage then diminishes until the time came when, as is well known, verses so accented were not thought tolerable at all. The avoidance of proparoxytona at the end of the iambic trimeter, which is very marked in the writings of Georgius Pisidas, hardly seems to have been a distinct characteristic of earlier poets, or to have been a matter of natural development at all. The remarks which follow upon the versification of Babrios and of Nonnos are more intricate in character and could hardly be made interesting here.

4. pp. 245-250. F. Heerdegen. Notes on Cicero's Orator. Proves that *all* the mutuli are copies of the Abrincensis.

5. pp. 251-292. E. Rohde. *Scenica*. I. The clearest account of the *προάγων* which has come down to us is to be found Schol. Aeschin. in Ctes. 67: *προάγων· ἐγίγνοντο πρὸ τῶν μεγάλων Διονυσίων ἡμέραις ὀλίγαις ἐμπροσθεν ἐν τῷ ᾧδεῖ καλουμένῳ τῶν τραγῳδῶν ἁγῶν καὶ ἐπίδειξις ὧν μέλλονσι δραμάτων ἀγωνίζεσθαι ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ· δὲ δ' ἐτόμως προάγων καλεῖται, εἰσίσαι δὲ δίχα προσώπων οἱ ὑποκριταὶ γυνοί.* That the poets came before the audience on these occasions is clear from a familiar story told in one of the Lives of Euripides: *λέγουσι δὲ καὶ Σοφοκλέα, ἀκούσαντα ὅτι ἐτελεύτησεν, αὐτὸν μὲν ἐν ἱματίῳ φαῖφ' προσελθεῖν τὸν δὲ χορὸν καὶ τοὺς ὑποκριτὰς ἀστεφανώτους εἰσαγαγεῖν ἐν τῷ προάγωνι καὶ δακρῦσαι τὸν δῆμον.* And there is great probability in assuming that Sokrates alludes to the *προάγων*, Plat. Symp. 194 A: *ἐπιλήσμων μὲντ' ἂν εἴην, ὧ' Ἀγάθων, εἰ ἰδὼν τὴν σὴν ἀνδρείαν καὶ μεγαλοφροσύνην ἀναβαίνοντος ἐπὶ τὸν ὀκρίβαντα μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν καὶ βλέψαντος ἐναντία τοσούτῳ θεάτρῳ, μέλλοντος ἐπιδείξεσθαι σαντοῦ λόγους, καὶ οὐδ' ὀπωστιοῦν ἐκπλαγέντος νῦν οἰσθεῖην σε θορυβηθῆσεσθαι ἔνεκα ἡμῶν ὀλίγων ἀνθρώπων.* In this passage the words *τοσούτῳ θεάτρῳ* mean nothing more definite than *so great an audience*; and about the word *ὀκρίβας* we at least know no reason why it should not denote the platform of the Odeion. From the passage first quoted, we know that the *προάγων* was something which might be called an *ἐπίδειξις*, and it was an *ἐπίδειξις* in which Agathon had behaved so creditably. What was this *ἐπίδειξις*? It can hardly have been a preliminary *ἁγῶν* in any wise; much more probably it was something preliminary to the *ἁγῶν*, a public exhibition at which the then chosen contestants came before the public, each with his chorus, his poet, his actors, and at which public proclamation of announcements for the coming contest was made. It was a usage of which a dwindled remnant is to be seen in the *pronuntiatio tituli* before the play began at Rome. As *πρόγαμος* to *γάμος*, as *προδικασία* to *δίκη*, so *προάγων* to *ἁγῶν*. II. In dramatic contests there was one victory for play and chorus, another for the protagonist. And it might be the winning protagonist had acted in an unsuccessful play. Inscriptions and other sources give ample indications of the existence of this custom in the fourth century. R. now finds an evidence that it was in force as early as 422 B. C. in a choregic inscription restored and published by Köhler (Mitth. d. deutschen Arch. Inst. III 108). III. There is a story in Herodotos (VI 21), known to every school-boy, from which apparently an obvious and important inference has not yet been drawn: *ποιήσαντι Φρυνίχῳ δράμα Μιλήτων ἄλωσιν καὶ διδάξαντι ἐς δάκρυά τε ἐπεσε τὸ θέητρον, καὶ ἐζημίωσάν μιν ὡς ἀναμνήσαντα οἰκία κακὰ χιλίσαι δραχμῆσι, καὶ ἐπέταξαν μηκέτι μηδένα χρᾶσθαι τούτῳ τῷ δράματι.* Does not this last clause prove beyond peradventure that it was, even from the earliest period of the Attic drama, a natural and customary thing for tragedies to be repeated in Attica? Of course these repetitions did not take place in the city at the times when only new plays were admissible; but they may well have taken place even there on other occasions, and there are abundant indications of such things in the Peiraieus and the outlying demes.

6. pp. 293-300. J. Baunack. The Laconian Word *κασσηρατόριν* and the *θηρομαχία* among the Greeks. The word *κασσηρατόριν* occurs in two Laconian inscriptions of the time of Marcus Aurelius, which commemorate victories in public games. The connection in each case indicates that the word is an

accusative, the name of some game. B. explains it as a Laconian form of an assumed *καταθηρατόριον*. The Laconian dialect shows apocope of *κατὰ* in other instances; the *θ* would regularly appear as *σ* in Laconian; a natural assimilation thus gives *κασσ-*. The Laconian dialect also furnishes examples of the compression of *-ιον* into *-iv*. The game in question, then, seems to have consisted in hunting down some dangerous beast. From the elder Pliny (H. N. VIII 45) and from Suetonius (Clund. 21) we learn of the bull-fights of the Thessalians and of their introduction into Rome. And from various sources, chiefly inscriptions, we know that bull-fighting was practised in several parts of Asia Minor from the first century B. C. on, and that the game was called *ταυροκαθάψια*, *ταυροφόνια*, *τάβρια*, *ταυροχόλια*.

7. pp. 301-316. Miscellany. E. Rohde writes of a neglected fragment of Ptolemy Lagi. The fragment, if such it may be called, is found in the fifteenth chapter of Synesius's discourse in praise of baldness. Then Ptolemy is quoted as authority for the story that at the battle of Arbela a Persian got hold of a Macedonian by the hair and beard and so got the better of him; that soon all the Persians, casting aside their weapons, were imitating the example thus set; and that Alexander, to avoid threatening defeat, withdrew his men from the battle until he could have them all shaved. That Synesius had read the original work of Ptolemy is improbable; and, wherever he may have read the story he meant to quote, his memory doubtless played tricks with him. What Ptolemy really told can have been nothing more than that Alexander at some time gave orders for the shaving of the beards of his soldiers, as related by Plutarch, Thes. 5, and Polyainos, IV 3, 2.

M. Schanz gives some examples to show that Kayser, the editor of *Philos-tratos*, sadly lacked method in the use of the diplomatic material of his editions.

O. Crusius points out that the Greek proverbs found by Graux (Rev. de Philologie, II 219 ff.) in a MS of the Escorial, and supposed by him to be unpublished, are to be found in a volume of miscellanies printed by the Aldine press in 1505, and that the Aldine edition has better readings than the Escorial MS.

G. Busolt finds in the Athenian tribute-lists indications that the Chalcidian cities were not all entirely faithful to the empire during the revolt of Samos. He also gives a brief discussion of the cost of suppressing that revolt, which he thinks must have exceeded two thousand talents.

A. Schaefer notes some small details touching the kings of the Bosphoros.

H. Heydeman thinks the *στήλη* upon which the name of Pheidias as sculptor of the Parthenos was inscribed (Plut. Per. 13) was plainly the pillar which supported the outstretched right hand of the statue, as seen in the recently discovered copy.

F. Leo adds a note to his *Epistula Plautina*, published in the previous number of the Rh. Mus. He admits that *ipsorum*, *ipsarum*, are found in Cornificius, Cicero, and Caesar.

C. v. Paucker gives a list of words not yet registered in the lexicons which he has found in the old Latin translation of the Gynaecia of Soranus. The most interesting of these words is *frigdor*, which seems to be formed upon the analogy of *caldor*.

G. Loewe tells of the discovery at Milan of a MS supposed to be lost of the *Johannis of Corippus* (published in the *Mon. Germ. Hist., Auct. Antiq. III, 2*).

J. H. WHEELER.

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR PHILOGIE UND PAEDAGOGIK. 1882.¹

Heft 7.

66. Zu Sophokles Elektra. I. Renner. Textual criticisms for lines 363-4, 495 ff., 724-7, 1005-6, 1009-10.

67. Zu Solon. Heidenhain. On the translation of the closing distichon of a poem by Solon. This is to be found in Dindorf's *Excerpta Vaticana* from Diodorus (Vol. III 23).

68. Zu Theognis. Ch. Ziegler. Textual criticism based on the Vatican MS.

69. Dionysios Periegetes. G. F. Unger. An article in support of K. Müller, who identifies Dion. Per. with the grammarian Dionysios, who flourished under Nero and his successors until Trajan. The article also combats the views of Bernhardt and Tycho Mommsen.

70. Zu Apollodoros BIBAIOΘHKH. W. Gemoll. Various textual criticisms.

(44). Zu Athenaios. Röhl. Textual criticisms.

71. Thielmann's *Das verbum dare* im lat. als repraesent. d. indogerm. wurzel *dha*. A review by Landgraf, who recommends the work most earnestly to all students in the domain of the history of language. This subject has also been treated of by Darmesteter in his '*de conjugatione Latini verbi dare*' (Paris, 1877), and in Langen's '*Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Plautus*.' The present work is, however, more exhaustive.

72. *Conjectanea Lucretiana*. J. Woltjer. On VI 17, 29 and 30.

73. Zu Ciceros Rede 'pro Milone.' A. Uppenkamp. A critical note on §29.

74. In *Plauti Truculentum*. E. Baehrens. After calling Schoell to account, the writer proposes changes in the text in vv. 4-5, 7, 10, 30-40, and seeks to justify his proposed changes.

75. Bentley's *Emendationen zu Senecas Tragoedien*. A. Stachelscheid.

76. *Die Verba Stringere, Juventare, Lactizare*. H. Rönsch.

77. Zu Arnobius. H. Wenzsky. Various changes in the text are proposed.

78. Zum *Panegyricus des Pacatus*. E. Klusmann. A critical note.

Hefte 8, 9.

79. *Die Entwicklung d. Homerischen Poesie von Niese*. Review by Kammer. The book is said to be of great importance, and is cordially recommended to the careful study of all friends of Homer.

80. *Ueber die Sprache d. Griechischen Elegiker*. The article is by Sitzler, who has contributed the results of his studies on the Greek elegiac writers in some of the previous numbers of the *Jhbr*. The present article notices the

¹ See A. J. P. VI 242. In order to overtake the arrears of this report extreme compression has been found necessary.—B. L. G.

use of $\kappa=\pi$ ($\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon=\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon$), the digamma, discusses the case endings, also the personal endings, as the elegiac writers use them, and finally various metrical peculiarities; especially vowels before mutes and liquids.

81. Die Aigis bei Homeros. P. Stengel. Was the Aigis a hide or a shield? S. upholds the latter view.

82. Inscriptiones Graecae antiquiss. praet. Atticas in Attica repert. Edidit Roehl. Rev. by Meister. The mechanical execution is highly praised; the editing is also commended with certain reserves.

83. Zu der neuen Inschrift von Larisa. Fr. Blass.

84. Zu Appianos. B. Hirschwälder. A critical note.

85. Zu Aischylos. J. Oberdick. This is almost throughout a complaint against Kirchhoff's edition of Aischylos, for failing to give proper credit where he has borrowed from O. and from Paley, and for ignoring the work done on Aischylos by the school of Westphal.

86. Sprachliche Kriterien für die Chronologie der Platonischen Dialoge. A. Frederking. Considerations as to the method and the results of Dittenberger's well known article in *Hermes*, XVI 321-345 (see A. J. P. III 376). F. does not consider $\tau\acute{\iota} \mu\eta\nu$, of which D. has made so much, as a satisfactory criterion when taken by itself, and compares the order as made out by D. on the basis of $\tau\acute{\iota} \mu\eta\nu$ with the result of observations on the use of $\tau\epsilon$, $\mu\omega\nu$, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\nu$ and $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$ instead of $\eta\nu$ (η), $\epsilon\phi\eta\nu$ ($\epsilon\phi\eta$). F. is not disposed to discourage this line of research; indeed he urges to the continuance of the toilsome task. He only protests against premature conclusions.

87. Die tragische Furcht bei Aristoteles. R. Philippson. This comes as an approval and at the same time a supplement of the work which Siebeck has done on the *Katharsis-frage*, pages 225-237 in the current year (1882) of the *Jhbr.*

88. Zu Platons *Politikos*. K. J. Liebhold. Mainly textual criticism.

(39). Die Tübinger Nonnos-Handschrift. E. Patzig.

89. Etruskische Studien. J. G. Cuno. 40 pages, mainly on the Evander legend. The most striking hypothesis advanced is that the word Evander is a corruption for Effandus, that the hero therefore was of Italian origin. The myth which made him of Greek origin is an invention of those Greeks who first came to Etruria and imagined they heard their own word $\epsilon\beta\alpha\nu\delta\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma$ in the somewhat indistinctly understood word Effandus. That Evander was then declared to be of Arcadian origin arose from the fact that a very old word for Italy, or at least that part of it about Latium and Campania, was Argessa. This is older than the Etruscan word, which was Italia itself. The Greeks took Argessa and Arkadia to be essentially the same words; and Palatium, the word for the Palatine hill, they identified with Pallantium in Arkadia.

90. Zu Julius Firmicus Maternus. B. Dombart.

91. Vorlesungen von K. Reisig, neu bearbeitet von H. Hagen. Notice by K. E. Georges, Gotha.

92. Zu Julius Florus. W. Gemoll. A critical note.

93. Cicero und die Attiker. O. Harnecker. This article treats of the

discussion which Cicero had with the Atticists of his time, especially with Brutus and Calvus, who, with Caelius Rufus and Scribonius Curio, were the chiefs of the Atticists. That Cic. had corresponded with Calvus and Brutus on Attic style is proved from a letter to Brutus, XV 21, III 11. Allusion is made in XV 21 to a letter to Calvus on rhetoric. This letter was written between Sept. 48 and Sept. 47. In 51-50 'Atticism' flourished in Rome, while the literary settlement of the controversy with Cicero in reference to Atticism is to be placed in 48 and the year following.

94. Cicero de Inventione. Eussner.

(25). Zu Catullus. P. Pabst.

95. Zu Cicero de Natura Deorum. Schwenke. Section 1.49 f. is discussed and interpreted. Reasons justifying the interpretation are given. The translation is: die götter sind von menschlicher gestalt, haben aber kein corpus, sondern ein quasi-corpus, sie sind nemlich von solcher beschaffenheit, dass sie nicht den sinnen, sondern nur dem geiste sichtbar sind, und nicht, wie die *σπερμια*, den unmittelbaren eindruck von körpern hervorbringen, sondern erst durch einen schluss als analoga von solchen begriffen werden, auch sind sie nicht einzeln zu unterscheiden, sondern durch anschauungen der von ihnen ausgehenden bilder erhält der geist nur einen allgemeinen begriff, nemlich den eines ewigen und seligen wesens; in wirklichkeit sind sie aber, wie weitere erwägung zeigt, unendlich der zahl nach.

96. Zu Tacitus. Meiser und Dräger.

97. Grimm's der Römische Brückenkopf in Kastel. Review by F. Otto.

98. Zu Seneca. O. Weise.

Heft 10.

99. Homerische Studien. A. Kiene. An article in two chapters, the first containing 'two facts and a theorem,' with reference to the unity of authorship of the Iliad and the Odyssey, the second discussing the way in which they were divided when recited at the Great Panathenaic games.

100. Zum fünften buche der Odyssee. C. Gneisse. The first part of the article calls attention to the artistic touch with which Homer drew the character of Hermes in the address to Kalypso; the second shows how deep a psychological insight Homer displays in the dialogue between Kalypso and Odysseus (lines 159-191 and 202-224).

101. Eine seltene anwendung von *pungere*. H. Rönsch. 'The meaning to which attention is called, namely, is 'to punch with the hand,' 'to dig.'

102. Zu Theokritos Eidyllion XXVII. Ch. F. Sehrwald. Textual criticisms.

103. Der Vertrag der Athener mit den Halieen. H. Müller-Strübing discusses the Eucleidean inscript. (CIA. IV p. 20), which contains a fragment of the treaty between the Athenians and the *Ἀλκίς*. At the disastrous conclusion of the Sicilian expedition the Halieans seem, as the writer shows, to have remained true to the Athenians, or at any rate not to have submitted again to the hegemony of the Lakedaimonians. The Laches, whose name occurs in the inscription, is not the one who was killed at the battle of Mantinea in 418.

104. Zu Aristophanes' Wolken. A. Drescher. Read *ψέγειν* for *λέγειν*, v. 528.

106. Käseopfer. P. Stengel. Attention is called to the fact that most books on Greek antiquities omit mention of cheese as a gift in sacrifices.

106. Die metaphor im Lateinischen von Plautus bis Terentius. P. Langen. Stress is laid upon the greater richness in P. than in Terence. There is a great quantity of new formations as well as of metaphorical expressions in Plautus, which one seeks in vain for in Terent. A list of words, used more or less frequently in a metaphorical sense in P., is given as far as from A to Z. The list is completed in the following fascicle, pp. 753-779.

107. An analysis of the opening of Vergil's Georgics, IV, extending through 26 pages. The writer, W. H. Kolster, comes to the conclusion that Verg. inserted certain lines in books I and III, referring to deeds of Augustus, performed as separate units after the composition of the poems; that these inserted vv. are III 26-39; 46-48; I 24-39; and that the erection of the temple of the Palatine Apollo was the chief cause of his making these insertions. The four chapters into which the article is divided are taken up with an analysis of the four parts of the introduction discussed: III 1-25, 26-39, 40-45, 46-48.

(96). Zu Tacitos. Grunauer. In hist. I 50, omit *et Perusiam ac Mutinam*.

Heft II.

108. Drei schriften von Leopold Wojewodsky. Rev. by Lugebil. W. is Professor of Greek at Odessa; his works are all in Russian, and none of them have been translated. L. gives the contents of the three treatises to which he calls attention, together with criticisms upon them. They are "Cannibalism in the Greek myths," "Studies introductory to the Criticism and the Mythology of the Odyssey," and "An Introduction to the Mythology of the Odyssey."

109. Die opfer der fluss- und quellgottheiten in Griechenland. P. Stengel. This deals mainly with the question whether horses were offered in sacrifices to streams, through a connection which streams have with Poseidon. In Iliad ϕ 30, it is not the Greeks who offer the horse sacrifice; nor in Pausanias, VIII 7, 2, is the sacrifice in honor of a river god. The article is in line with those which appeared in the Jhbr. for 1872, p. 421; 1873, pp. 196 and 704.

110. Zenon von Kition. F. Susemihl. On Diogenes Laertios, VII 1-12 and 24-29; an effort to fix the time of Zenon and the age which he reached.

111. Zu Platons Apologie des Sokrates. E. Goebel. Explanatory and critical notes on 10 passages.

(42). Zu Dionysios von Halicarnasos. L. Sadée. Critical notes.

(43). Horatius, Carm. II 11, 1 ff. Th. Plüss.

(106). Conclusion of Langen's article on Metaphor in Latin from Plautus to Terence.

112. Ad Plauti Mil. Glor. v. 438. Th. Hasher emends thus: *ἀγλακῆς* es tu, *νόη γλακεῖα* 's: *méo ero facis iniúriam*.

113. Das antike buchformat der Römischen Elegiker. A short article by Baehrens, criticising to some extent Birt's 'Das antike Buchwesen' and his interpretation of a quotation from Suetonius by Isidorus (VI 12), bearing upon

das ant. buchwesen. Birt's conclusion that books of poetry were written with 43 lines on a page, and never numbered more than 26 pages, seems to Baehrens specially objectionable. He shows from the Herculanean rolls how impossibly big that would make a book of poetry especially. From Plinius (N. H. XIII, §78) he finds that the *sealides* were of various widths; and how really little was often written on one of these he shows from the picture of a papyrus roll upon a Pompeian painting, Zangemeister, CIL IV, plate XVIII 1. Finally how the poems of Tibullus have come down to us in a confused order.

114. Zu Q. Curtius Rufus. Eleven passages emended by Jaep, Wolfenbüttel.

115. Philologische Schriftstellerlexicon von W. Pökel. Leipzig, 1882. viii and 328 pages. Notice by Klusmann.

116. Zu Sallustius. E. Grunauer. Twenty lines of explanation and emendation on Cat. 59, 2.

117. Zu Teuffels Röm. Litteraturgeschichte. S. Schwabe. Ten lines calling attention to a mistake on page 913, 4th ed.

Hef 12.

118. Rechtfertigungen zu meiner recension des ersten buches der Aristotelischen Politik. Anhang: Einiges zum zweiten buche der Politik. Moriz Schmidt. 24 pp.

(8). Zu Stobaios Anthologion. R. Dressler. A critical note on VII 40.

119. Zu den Theokritoscholien. Ch. Ziegler.

(110). Zenon von Kition. E. Rohde. A page of reply to Sussemihl (see above).

120. Zum fünften buche des Lucretius. A. Kannengiesser. An investigation into the condition in which the great work of Lucretius was left at his death. The writer's conclusion is: dass L. das 5te buch bereits vollständig ausgearbeitet hatte, als er sich entschloss dasselbe durch einzelne zusätze sowohl als besonders dadurch zu erweitern, dass er, von der bearbeitung nur einige momente in der culturentwicklung des menschen, zu einem kurzen abriß der ganzen culturgeschichte überging.

121. Zur würdigung des Dichters Tibullus. A lecture by Grasberger on the time of Tibullus, and on the contemporary poets and the difference in the court favor which Messala and Maecenas showed to the Roman poets.

(7). Zur erklärang der Aeneis. Th. Plüss. P.'s work on the Aeneis has been collected and published by Teubner, in one volume, during the present year. This article has to do with II 752 ff.

122. Zu Tacitus Germania. A. du Mesnil. A critical note of 18 lines.

(73). Zu Ciceros rede pro Milone. A page of reply to Uppenkamp's note. The passage is in §29, and the question is whether *non* should be inserted before *ferre*.

(25). A note of textual criticism on Catullus 64, 16. A. Riese.

123. A review of Palmer's Propertius. K. P. Schultze. The review thinks little of Palmer's critical judgment on account of the estimation in which he holds N (see A. J. P. I 389), and still less of Palmer's emendations.

(98). Zu Seneca. H. Goell. A textual criticism on de benef. II, 12, 2, with reference to O. Weise (see above).

124. Zu der form *prode* = *prod*, *pro*. Rönsch.

(39). Noch einmal die Tübinger Nonnoshandschrift. H. Flach.

(65). Philologische gelegenheitsschriften.

W. E. WATERS.

ROMANIA. No. 41.¹

Paulin Paris et la Littérature française du moyen âge. Leçon d'ouverture du cours de langue et de littérature françaises du moyen âge au Collège de France, le jeudi 8 décembre, 1881. By Gaston Paris. A rather modest but very just tribute to his father.

L'histoire de Guillaume le Maréchal Comte de Striguil et de Pembroke, Régent d'Angleterre. Poème français inconnu. Ed. by Paul Meyer. The poem contains 19,214 octosyllabic lines, Norman dialect. M. is of the opinion that French literature of the Middle Ages contains no work, up to the time of Froissart, equal to this in point of historical and literary value, not even excepting Villehardouin and Joinville. The editor gives copious extracts, amounting to several thousand lines.

J. Cornu continues his Études de grammaire portugaise.

Versions inédites de la chanson de Jean Renaud. By G. Paris. These versions are published preparatory to a detailed examination of Svend Grundtvig's book, *Elveskud*, on the "chanson française de Jean Renaud et celles qui, chez les autres peuples, lui sont apparentées."

Corrections aux Textes publiés du manuscrit de Carpentras No. 37 (see Vol. XXV des Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences de Vienne). By Alfred Morel-Fatio.

Nos. 42-43.

Extraits des Archives du Vatican pour servir à l'histoire littéraire. (Suite.) By Antoine Thomas. Account is given of Philippe de Vitri, Gace de la Bigne, and Pierre de Bersuire.

Proverbes Rimés de Raimond Lull. By A. Morel-Fatio. They number 174, in riming couplets.

La Versification de la Chirurgie provençale de Raimond d'Avignon. By A. Thomas. A complete working over of the subject formerly treated by T. in Romania, X, p. 63-74.

Étude sur les manuscrits du Roman d'Alexandre. By Paul Meyer. An exhaustive study covering 120 pages. It was originally intended to form one of the appendices of the author's 'Histoire de la Légende d'Alexandre dans les pays romans.' The object of the present article is: 1, de déterminer autant que faire se peut, l'individualité de chaque branche dans l'ensemble du roman d'Alexandre; 2, de faire connaître un épisode, jusqu'à présent inédit, de ce roman; 3, de décrire les mss. ou fragments de mss. de l'*Alexandre* qui nous sont parvenus.

¹ See A. J. P. IV 517.

Souhais de bienvenue adressés à Ferdinand le Catholique par un poète barcelonais, en 1473. By A. Morel-Fatio. Sixteen stanzas of 9 dodecasyllabic lines each, riming: *a, b, a, b, c, d, c, c, d*. The dialect is a mixed Castilian and Catalan. The author was probably a Catalan, who essayed to write in Castilian.

Texte portugais du XIV siècle: *Vida de Eufrosina*; *Vida de Maria Egipcia*; *Traité de Dévotion* (Extraits). By J. Cornu. These Lives and the Extraits are taken from MS 266 of the old library of the Convent of Alcobaça, now deposited in the Torre do Tombo at Lisbon.

Versions piémontaises de la chanson populaire de Renaud. (See Romania, XI 97.) By C. Nigra.

Mélanges. I. G. Paris cites a passage from St. Augustine (Confess. lib. I, c. xviii) to show that while the well educated (*les gens du monde*) aspirated the Latin initial *h* in the fourth century, the people did not pronounce it. This *h*, therefore, seems to have been a dead letter with the Romance peoples almost from the beginning. II. A tilt between Suchier and G. Paris in regard to the date and place of composition of the *Chanson de Roland*, the former contending for the twelfth century, the latter for some time prior to the first crusade.

Comptes-Rendus. Adolfo Bartoli's *Crestomazia della poesia italiana del periode delle origini* is severely criticized by J. Ulrich for its imperfections.

No. 44.

Le Carmen de Prodicione Guemonis et la légende de Roncevaux. By G. Paris. The Latin poem here produced for the second time (first pub. by F. Michel in 1837) is to be found in folios 153-155 of the Cottonian MS Titus. A. XIX of the British Museum. It contains 482 lines. The MS is of the fifteenth century; the date of composition, P. thinks, is the first half of the twelfth century. A long critical examination by the editor follows the text.

Le miracle de Sardenai. By G. Raynaud. A poem of 453 lines in riming couplets. The original language uncertain, but a number of its characteristics point to Picardy.

Aquilon de Bavière, Roman Franco-Italien. By A. Thomas. A *roman* in prose, belonging to the Carolingian cycle. Its author was Raphael Marmora, and it was composed between 1379 and 1407. Place of composition Verona. The editor gives the story in extracts.

Mélanges. Corrections sur la *Vie de Saint Gilles*, de Guillaume de Berneville, publiée par G. Paris et A. Bos.

Comptes-Rendus. Two very important works favorably reviewed by G. Paris, namely: *Die Romanischen Landschaften des Römischen Reiches. Studien über die inneren Entwicklungen in der Kaiserzeit*. Von Dr. Julius Jung, a. o. Professor der alten Geschichte an der k. k. Universität zu Prag. Innsbruck, Wagner, 1881, 8vo. xxxii + 574; and, *Die Ausbreitung der lateinischen Sprache über Italien und die Provinzen des Römischen Reiches*. Von Dr. Alexander Budinsky, Professor an der Universität Czernowitz. Berlin, Hertz, 1881, 8vo. xii + 267.

Chronique. The death is noted of two of the Romania's most active

collaborators: Victor Smith, student of French folk-lore; and Napoleon Caix, who, besides contributing articles to several journals on Italian literature and philology, published in 1880 (Firenze, Le Monnier), *Le Origini della lingua poetica italiana; principii di grammatica storica italiana ricavati dallo studio dei manoscritti*.

No. 45.

Le Roman de la Geste de Monglane. By G. Paris. A dissentient criticism of Léon Gautier's position regarding the relations of the manuscript of the poem to the early printed copies.

Dit sur les Vilains, par Matazone de Calignano. Ed. by Paul Meyer. A poem of 184 lines, generally hexasyllabic. The dialect is north Italian, resembling in many respects the Tuscan. The MS seems to be of the second half of the fourteenth century.

Essai de Phonétique et de Phonologie de la Langue portugaise d'après le dialecte actuel de Lisbonne. By A. R. Gonçalves Vianna. This is an essay on the pronunciation and phonology of the Portuguese language. It does not touch upon the derivation of the letters from the Latin. A very thorough, complete and scholarly production, filling 70 pages of the review.

Nos. 46-47.

La Vie de Saint Grégoire le Grand traduite du Latin par Frère Angier, Religieux de Sainte-Fridesuide. Pub. by P. Meyer. Poem of 2954 lines, here published for the first time. Translation made between 1212 and 1214. The MS belongs to the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris. A facsimile of two pages of the MS is given. The place and date of composition being exactly known, the poem furnishes a fine specimen for the study of the Anglo-Norman language and literature. M. appends a few remarks on the phonetics, inflexions and versification, and a short glossary.

Des Avocas, De la Jument au Deable, De Luque la Maudite: Trois dits tirés d'un nouveau manuscrit de Fableaux. Pub. by G. Raynaud. Taken from a MS of the Hamilton collection (Berlin Museum). The first is a poem of 384 lines (8 syllables); the second (222 lines) is interesting as treating of a belief, very common in the Middle Ages, that a *prestresse* (concubine of a priest) would, at death, be changed into a black mare and be ridden by the devil; the third (196 lines) contains a version of the famous legend of Maisnie Hellequin, which was especially current in Normandy in the Middle Ages. A glossary is appended.

Mélanges de littérature catalane. II. *Le livre des trois choses*. By A. Morel-Fatio.

Phonologie syntactique du Cancioneiro Geral. By J. Cornu. An exhaustive treatment of the subject, and will prove an excellent addendum to Gonçalves Vianna's essay mentioned above in No. 45 (Rom. XII 29).

La Claire Fontaine, chanson populaire française. Examen critique des diverses versions, par J. Gilliéron.

Comptes-Rendus. G. Paris notices H. Breymann's edition of F. Diez's *Kleinere Arbeiten und Recensionen* (München u. Leipzig, Oldenbourg, 1883,

8vo. xvi + 352); he likewise speaks very kindly of Miss Martha Carey Thomas's Dissertation, Sir Gawayne and the Green Knight, though differing with some of her conclusions.

Chronique. Short obituary notices of a number of Romance scholars: Anatole Boucherie, Karl Witte, Adelbert von Keller, Lorenz Diefenbach, Ugo Angelo Canello, and others of less note.

No. 48.

Deux fragments épiques. Otinel, Aspremont. By Ernest Langlois. The first fragment contains 293 lines of the Chanson d'Otinel, corresponding to verses 639 to 929 of the edition in print; the second 595 lines of the Chanson d'Aspremont, beginning at about the 85th verse of the poem, which has not yet been edited in its entirety. The MS belongs to the archives of the department of Lozère, at Mende. The writing is of the thirteenth century, the scribe an Anglo-Norman.

Études sur les Romans de la Table Ronde. Lancelot du Lac. II. Le Conte de la Charrette. By G. Paris. An analysis and study of the poem of Chrétien de Troyes (completed by Godefroi de Laigni), and of the Roman de Lancelot in prose, which contains a biography of this knight from his birth to his death, and which, together with the Saint Graal and Merlin, constitutes a great cycle of compositions nearly related to each other. The second division of the article is occupied in contesting the positions of Jonckbloet and Maertens regarding the relations between the poem and prose version. In the third division P. essays "de retrouver l'origine et le sens primitif du récit conté par Chrétien, et de marquer l'importance qu'a dans l'histoire littéraire l'œuvre du poète champenois."

L'Orma del Leone. Racconto orientale considerato nella tradizione popolare. *Syntepas*, redazione greca dell' opera indiana *Il libro di Sindibad*. L'anello del re. By Stanislao Prato. A capital story aside from its interest to students of folk-lore.

Contes de la Bigorne. By Dr. Dejeanne.

Comptes-Rendus. G. Paris reviews George Saintsbury's Short History of French Literature. While giving full credit to this most excellent book, the critic points out numerous errors, which should be rectified in a future edition.

Chronique. Death noted of Svend Grundtvig, Alexandre Lambrior, and Andrés Balaguer y Merino.

SAMUEL GARNER.

HERMES, 1884.¹

No. III.

H. Buermann, pp. 325-368, prints the second instalment of critical notes on the text of Isaeus.

M. Schanz, Zu den sogenannten *Διαλέξεις*. These 'disputationes morales' are reprinted in Mullach's *Fragm. Philos.* I 544-552, which edition of this anonymous composition is severely criticized by Schanz for the errors it has copied. The *διαλέξεις* were probably written by some contemporary of Plato. Schanz considers them authentic. He also gives a list of thirteen MSS con-

¹ See A. J. P. VI 118.

taining the work, of which MSS six are in Paris. Most of them are of comparatively late date and of small critical value.

L. Schwabe (Tübingen) maintains, in opposition to Schanz, that the work mentioned by Augustine (*de haeresibus, praef.*), *Opiniones omnium philosophorum*, is indeed the work of C. Celsus the medical writer, not of some Christian author of that name. Schwabe holds that the 'Opiniones' were a part of the comprehensive work referred to by Quintilian XII II, 24: *Quid plura? cum etiam Cornelius Celsus mediocri vir ingenio non solum de his omnibus conscripserit artibus sed amplius rei militaris et rusticae et medicinae praecepta reliquerit*. According to St. Augustine, about one hundred philosophers were mentioned in the work.

Mommsen, *Die Italische Bodentheilung u. die Alimentartafeln*. This is a treatise on farms, their designation, values, the modes of agricultural industry and the like. The technical term for farm was *fundus*, *praedium* being a synonym. The name of the first legal owner, to whom it was conferred by *assignatio* on part of the state, was generally maintained for the purpose of permanent identification, e. g. 'fundus Naevianus,' 'fundus Antonianus,' etc. When several *fundi* made up one estate, they were either designated individually or the principal fundus only was named. Some inss. in C. I. L. X present many facts and figures. The *fundi* there named are, however, not presented according to their area, but according to their money-value. On pp. 399-400 Mommsen gives a list of single *fundi*—each being a separate estate, their assessed value being from 110,000 sesterces down to 24,000; a few estates are also given which contained three or four *fundi*, the largest embracing four *fundi* and twenty-five pastures. The majority of one-farm estates are rated at a figure varying between 60,000 and 30,000 sesterces. The same property indeed in the time of Trajan is found to be in fewer hands, but the decadence of small proprietors is by no means as radical as the current assumption would lead one to expect. Among fifty proprietors but two have an estate of the equestrian census, Annius Rufus owning four *fundi* and twenty-five pastures, representing a value of 451,000 sesterces; (n. Marcius Rufinus possesses an estate comprising eleven *fundi*, valued at 501,000 sesterces. These facts are given of Placentia and Veleia, while the condition of land at Beneventum was more favorable for small proprietors in the age of Trajan. As for the great proprietors they seem to have aimed at having landed estates in many different provinces; thus Seneca, Ep. 87, mentions a rich man, 'qui in omnibus provinciis arat.' Some of the large proprietors cultivated their lands with their own slaves through a slave-steward (*servus actor*), but in a majority of cases they let to smaller tenants, the owner living in Rome or in some other town. The statement of the Elder Pliny, H. N. XXIII 6, 35: *latifundia perdere Italiam, iam et provincias*, does not refer so much to the turning of farming lands into sheepwalks, as to the creation of vast estates. According to Pliny one-half of the land in the province of Africa belonged to six proprietors.

U. Wilcken publishes and comments on a document contained in one of the Fayûm papyri now preserved in the Berlin Museum. This document dates from 359 A. D., and is a deed of sale by which an officer of the mailed cavalry purchased a Gallic slave at Askalon.

Wilamowitz, Hippias von Rhegion. This historian or chronicler is made by Suidas to be a contemporary of the Persian wars. Wilamowitz essays to invalidate the majority of references made to Hippias in later Greek writers. In the latter part of his communication he makes an interesting digression to legends of miraculous cures wrought by Asklepios at Epidauros.

No. IV.

Robert, Alkyoneus. The vase-paintings which exhibit the contest of Hercules with the giant A. had been discussed by Fr. Koepp in the *Archaeologische Zeitung*. Robert differs from Koepp in his view of the legend, and sets forth his own view in the present paper. The four stages of development which Robert assumes for the myth are given on pp. 484-485.

H. Dessau, *Der Steuertarif von Palmyra*. This document is found on an inscription discovered in 1881 by an Armenian, Prince Simon Abamelek Lasarew. The decree of the Palmyrene *βουλή* dates from 137 A. D., in Hadrian's reign. It is rather curious that the municipality was empowered to impose such duties while being itself under Roman government. The ins. was written in Greek and Aramaic. As to goods, the unit of bulk was either a camel's load (*γόμεος*), or an ass's, the ratio being as of 13 to 7. These customs were farmed out to publicans. The amount of duties had in great part depended on usage, until it was considered desirable by the municipal government, in view of the many conflicts and complications between the publicans and the merchants, to fix the duties in detail. The inscription being preserved in a fragmentary condition, but a portion of the decree can be learned. On slaves the duty was 22 denarii; the duty levied on purple-dyed textile fabrics cannot be clearly gathered; for ointments conveyed in boxes (*ἀλλάβαστρα*, p. 507), 25 denarii per camel's load. In the importation of oil a distinction was made as to the mode of conveyance, *i. e.* whether a camel's load was in four or in two goatskins. A cartload (p. 510, *γόμεος καρρικὸς*) was rated at four times a camel's load. Shoemakers had to pay one denarius per month on their shops, dealers in hides 2 asses per hide. On every slaughtered animal an octroi was levied. But few parallels are found for such fiscal autonomy within the confines of the Roman empire.

Maas, *Die Iliasscholien des Codex Leidensis*. This MS is of the XV century and greatly inferior to the famous Venetus B. Maas takes great pains to sift the material. A number of blocks of commentary are introduced by the lemma *Πορφύριον*. Maas does not admit the authenticity of all of them. The general opinion of Maas may be found in the following (p. 563): "The exegetical matter is substantially the same in all MSS. Consequently the Scholia Minora render it possible to separate the exegetical commentary from the critical, particularly in Venetus A., and thereby to determine the contents of these totally heterogeneous commentaries. We learn in this way, *e. g.* that the exegetical commentary common to all MSS—we should rather say 'Scholia'—must have been compiled after Porphyry's time; it is used in all these MSS, even in the Scholia Minora; nay, the compilation must have been made after Orion, the etymologist of the V century A. D. The concordant extract from Orion, furnished with a *subscriptio*, in Venetus A and in the Townleianus

(*prima manus*) on K 290 proves that it had a place even in the common source of those masses of exegetical scholia. Still one can easily understand that old and valuable materials were worked into this compilation, which consists of entirely heterogeneous elements. It is necessary to analyse. Porphyry, Orion and the other quite late writers stand out at once. Likewise the *ιστορίαι*. They were evidently not composed to serve the interpretation of Homer; besides, much similar material is found in Latin scholia and elsewhere. They are based on a manual of mythology which can be and should be reconstructed."

Fr. Susemihl on three difficult passages in the Politics of Aristotle.

Br. Keil, De Isocratis Papyro Massiliensi. This is a Greek papyrus containing Isocr. ad Nicoclem 1-30. The late date of the MS is curiously evidenced by phonetic spelling, showing *e. g.* the advance of iotacism, *ει, η* and *ι* being equally represented by *ι*. Thus *ζητιν, σκοπιν, ευεργετιν, υμς, ιερια καταλειψς* and the like. The MS lacks accents and breathing marks.

Mommsen re-edits and comments on a Syrian Greek inscription in which the municipality of Aradus honors Pliny the Elder, who had been procurator in Syria. The MS was published some forty years ago by the Rev. W. M. Thompson, and then again in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1848, p. 253. In conclusion Mommsen says: "That a man like C. Plinius, who was active in Spain, Germany, Palestine, Syria and Egypt in civil and military functions, who wrote on cavalry manœuvres and held a high position in the general staff of the crown-prince, and who became a victim of his own scientific curiosity—that such a man was able and willing to write a work of pure erudition ("Ein Studierlampenbuch")—this fact becomes still more riddlesome than it had been before, through this clearing up of his career."

E. G. SIHLER.

BRIEF MENTION.

The number of books sent to the Journal for review has increased so much, the space that can be spared for this department is so small, and the helpers of the editor are so few, that it seems proper to say once for all that the management cannot guarantee reviews even of important works, and that publishers and authors must run the risk of the situation. An organized review department that should undertake to give a critical survey of contemporary philological work would indeed be highly desirable, but this would require a large staff of paid contributors, and at present the resources of the Journal only suffice to give an opportunity for the exercise of independent criticism; they do not suffice to command it. At the same time it must be said that every effort has been made and will be made to increase the usefulness of the Journal in this direction, within the limits prescribed by the space at the editor's disposal. Professor GARNETT has elsewhere generously promised to provide for the English department, and Professor ELLIOTT will continue his kind offices for Romance, and additional help is promised for the classics, for Shemitic and for Comparative Grammar.

One of the most important philological enterprises of our time, so rich in all manner of encyclopaedic undertakings, is IWAN MÜLLER's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, of which the first half of the second volume has reached us (Nördlingen, C. H. Beck). The work is to make seven volumes (or fourteen half volumes at 5 m. 50 pf. each), and is to be completed at furthest within the space of three years. To those who have watched the slow and irregular issue of great German works, this last assurance will be more than welcome. The different sections are to be in charge of approved specialists, and the young student of philology will be furnished, as he has never been furnished before, with a compact and comprehensive library of philological science. Instead of a compilation like Freund's *Triennium*, we shall have a work every part of which will be instinct with fresh life. Of course that fresh life will be aggressive and uncompromising in some cases, but each of the authors will have a right to his views, and the occasional absence of judicial balance is better than the helpless seesaw of a compromise. We have not space for the full prospectus, and can only say that the History of Philology will be treated by VON URLICH, Palaeography, Hermeneutics and Criticism by BLASS, Epigraphy by HINRICHS and HÜBNER, Lexikography by AUTENRIETH and HEERDEGEN, Rhetoric by VOLKMANN and Metres by GLEDITSCH. LOLLING has charge of the Geography of Greece and Asia, JORDAN of that of Italy and Rome. The editor will be responsible for Greek Private Antiquities. The important field of Greek Literature is assigned to VON CHRIST, of Roman to SCHANZ. In the part before us BRUGMANN has given us a Greek Grammar of which 94 pp. are taken up by the sounds and the inflexions—the syntax being reduced to a *minimum*

of space (42 pp.), although it is fair to say that every page of the forty-two is full of important matter, and clear, sharp statements of fact and principle. The same half-volume contains the beginning of a more elaborate Latin Grammar, of which Dr. STOLZ and Professor SCHMALZ are the authors—STOLZ having undertaken the Sounds and Inflexions, SCHMALZ the Syntax and Stylistic.—The second half of Vol. II comes to hand as we go to press. This shows that the publishing house is in earnest when it promises the speedy issue of the entire work. In this second half we have the conclusion of the Latin Syntax and Stylistic by SCHMALZ, Greek and Latin Lexicography by AUTENRIETH and HEERDEGEN, Rhetoric of the Greeks and Romans by VOLKMANN, and the Metres of the Greeks and Romans, with an Appendix on Greek Music by GLEDITSCH.

The value to the Homeric scholar of such a book as CARL EDUARD SCHMIDT'S *Parallel-Homer* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht) is self-evident. In this laborious work all the recurrent verses, half-verses, and parts of verses, to the extent of six morae, are presented in alphabetical order. The text followed is Dindorf's. The alphabetical order occasions difficulties which the compiler himself frankly acknowledges. So, for instance, a long string of familiar repetitions must be sought, not under the head of what we should regard as the catch-word of the line, but under the initial particle. Nor does the collector guarantee the absolute completeness of the work, although the statement that he has 'corrected and completed Seber's Index in numberless passages' will be accepted as good evidence of thoroughness, in view of the fact that Seber still serves to correct many rash assertions in regard to Homer. Interesting is the statement as to the number of repetitions. Schmidt has counted 1804 recurrent verses, which altogether amount to 4730. If we decline to count insignificant differences there are 2118, which appear 5612 times. If we add those that recur in both their halves, the number amounts to 9253 (Il. 5605, Od. 3648), almost exactly a third of all (Il. 15,693, Od. 12,160, together 27,853). This number is still further increased by the briefer recurrences, which added together and counted as verses, will swell the sum to the enormous aggregate of 16,000 verses, or more than the bulk of the Iliad. If we withdraw all repetitions, we shall have left about 12,000 verses, or about the bulk of the Odyssey. These are not mere figures. They show distinctly how much of the uniform color of these poems is due to what may be called the mechanical element. At any rate Dr. Schmidt will not be disappointed in his expectation that Homeric critics will make large use of his collection.

The *Φιλολογικαὶ Ὑποσημειώσεις* of DIONYSIOS THEREIANOS consist of three essays, entitled respectively *Παράλληλος πολιτικὴ καὶ φιλολογικὴ ἀνάπτυξις τῶν ἀρχαίων Ἑλλήνων*, *Ὁ ἑλληνισμὸς κατὰ λεκτικὴν καὶ πραγματικὴν ἔννοιαν*, and the third and most important, which we are glad to see rescued from the feuilleton state, *Ἰωάννης Ν. Οἰκονομίδης*, a sympathetic account of the life and work of a distinguished Hellenist, who, although he deliberately chose the *fallentis semita vitae*, could not efface himself as much as he seemed to desire, and who has found an eloquent encomiast in his disciple and bosom-friend. The style of the sketch is too diffuse, and in the vindication of his master Th. finds it necessary at each

section to begin with the beginning in order to make us feel the hidden wisdom of Oikonomides, but the interest that the essay had in its original environment is not lost in the more permanent form. (Trieste, Schimpff.)

In his *Beiträge zu einer Geschichte der lateinischen Grammatik im Mittelalter* (Halle, Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1885), Professor BAEBLER, after a slight and rapid sketch of the history of grammar from Plato to Remigius († 908), has given us a series of interesting chapters on the state of grammatical studies in the Middle Ages, with specimens of the approved manuals of that time, by the crass ignorance and the wild fancies of which we learn to measure the great debt we owe the Renaissance. As soon as the world lost its hold on Greek it lost its hold on grammar, and the curious attitude of the mediaeval mind toward the great language which was dimly felt to be the background of thought and culture may be studied with as much amusement as is compatible with pity in this attractive little volume.

Many students of New Testament Greek will welcome the neat and convenient 16mo *N. T.* of WESTCOTT AND HORT (Macmillan & Co.) The second impression of the larger edition (1881) has been followed. Various changes have been made in the way of simplification. We are glad to see that the brief and general statement of the principles of criticism by which the editors have been guided has not been sacrificed to the necessity of compression. In its present form the edition will be a favorite for the pocket and satchel of the ripper scholar as well as for the use of schools generally.

HOLZWEISSIG, who has done some suggestive work in Comparative Syntax especially in the domain of the cases, and who has produced a wonderfully compact Greek Syntax (second ed., 1881), has given to the world a *Lateinische Schulgrammatik* (Hannover, F. Goedel) adapted to the new order of things in Germany. Schoolbooks do not strictly fall within the range of this Journal and we have only space to say that the whole make-up of the work reveals the progress of Germany in the Americanization of its manuals.

MR. FURNEAUX has been encouraged by the success of his excellent larger edition of Tacitus' Annals to reproduce an abridgment of it for the use of schools and junior students: *Cornelii Taciti Annalium, Libri I-IV*, edited by H. FURNEAUX, M. A. (Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1885.)

It is impossible to keep pace with the rapid issue of the volumes of SCHENKL'S *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum* (Prague, Tempsky; Leipzig, Freytag). A noteworthy addition to the series, one that shows how wide is the scope of this great undertaking, is an edition of the *Orphica* by EUG. ABEL, the editor of the Pindaric scholia. From the preface we learn that this work is the forerunner of a larger edition. The appendix contains the Hymns of Proklos, Magic Hymns, and other curious and interesting remains from the same strange sphere of later Greek life.

Professor J. RENDEL HARRIS, one of the most esteemed collaborators of the Journal, has published a special treatise on the *Teaching of the Apostles and the Sibylline Books* (Cambridge, Eng.: H. W. Wallis, 1885), in which he has undertaken to show among some of the Sibyllists a very close acquaintance with the Teaching of the Apostles. Of course critics might turn this round and say that the coincidences show a very close acquaintance of the author of the Teaching with the Sibylline Books, but this is met by attacking the date assigned to the Second Book, in which more than sixty per cent. of the coincidences occur. This reopens the question of the date of Pseudo-Phokylides, a large part of whose poem has been inserted in the text of the Second Book. Bernays made the superior limit in time of the *ποίημα νουθετικόν*, from which the Sibyllist borrowed, to be the circulation of the LXX translation of the Scriptures, while the inferior limit is furnished by the absence of all traces of the N. T. and of Christianity, say the time of Nero. This statement of Bernays that there is no trace of the early Christian *διδασκαλία* in Ps. Phokylides is met by Professor Harris with a strong negative. Ps. Phokylides 'can only, by very rough criticism, be divested of sentiments which are either Christian or differ very slightly therefrom; and the whole tenor of the writing is exactly what can be explained by the first century.' Professor Harris's pamphlet is full of interest to the student of that remarkable document, the *Διδαχή*, the admirable edition of which by M. SABATIER (Paris, Fischbacher, 1885) has been waiting so long on the table of this Journal for an adequate review that a review is hardly needed, as its distinguishing features have already found hearty commendation among those who are best qualified to judge. It is to M. Sabatier that we must turn when we wish to understand the connexion between the *Διδαχή* and the synagogue.

Professor ISAAC FLAGG's edition of the *Seven against Thebes* (Ginn & Co.) is marked by his characteristic neatness and reserve. Especial attention seems to have been paid to position, and the grammatical element is not overdone, as is too often the case in American books.

GINN & CO. announce as ready January 1, 1886, *Studies in Greek Thought*. Essays selected from the papers of the late LEWIS R. PACKARD, Hillhouse Professor of Greek in Yale College. I. Morality and Religion of the Greeks. II. Plato's arguments in the *Phaedo* for the Immortality of the Soul. III. On Plato's scheme of Education as proposed in the Republic. IV. The *Œdipus Rex* of Sophokles. V. Summary of the *Œdipus Coloneus* of Sophokles. VI. Summary of the *Antigone* of Sophokles. VII. On the Beginnings of a Written Literature in Greece. Also, as ready soon, *Introduction to the Language and Verse of Homer*, by Professor T. D. SEYMOUR of Yale College.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. B. Westermann & Co., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Æschylus. *The Seven against Thebes*, with introduction and notes by I. Flagg. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1885. 9 + 129 pp. map. 12mo, cl., \$1.10.

Bingham (W.) *Latin Grammar*; new ed., rev. by W. Gordon McCabe. Philadelphia, *E. H. Butler & Co.*, 1885. 12mo, \$1.08.

Bissell (Edwin Cone, D. D.) *The Pentateuch*; its origin and structure. New York, *C. Scribner's Sons*, 1885. 6 + 484 pp. 8vo, \$3.00.

Caesar (C. J.) *Gallie War*; seven books; ed. by J. H. and W. F. Allen, and J. B. Greenough. Revised by H. P. Judson. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1885. 18 + 188 + 196 + 149 pp. cl., \$1.35.

Cicero (M. T.) *Laelius*; ed. for use of schools, with notes, etc., by E. S. Shuckburgh. (*Elementary Classics*.) New York, *Macmillan*, 1885. 160 pp. 16mo, cl., 40 cts.

Euripides. *Iphigenia in Tauris*; ed. with introd., notes and critical appendix. (*Clarendon Press Series*.) New York, *Macmillan*, 1885. 19 + 170 pp. 16mo, 75 cts.

Fisher (M. M.) *The three pronunciations of Latin*; 3d ed., rev. and enl. New York, *Appleton*, 1885. 229 pp. \$1.00.

Hodgson (W. B.) *Errors in the use of English*. Compiled and edited by J. D. Christie. New York, *Appleton*, 1885. 6 + 135 pp. 75 cts.

Knoflach (Augustin). *German simplified*. New York, *A. Knoflach*, 1885. 12 Nos., 207 pp. @ 10 cts.

Lodeman (A.) *The student's manual of exercises for translating into German*. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1885. 87 pp. 12mo, cl., 50 cts.

Plutarch. *Lives of the Gracchi*; with introd., notes and lex., by H. A. Holden. New York, *Macmillan*, 1885. 63 + 260 pp. 16mo, \$1.60.

Remer (J.) *Principles of general grammar*. New York, *Appleton*, 1885. 142 pp. 12mo, cl., \$1.25.

Whitney (W. D.) *A brief German grammar with references to his larger grammar*. New York, *H. Holt & Co.*, 1885. 8 + 129 pp. 16mo, 75 cts.

Whiton (J. M.) and Whiton (M. B.) *Three months' preparation for reading Xenophon*. New York, *Appleton*, 1885. 94 pp. 12mo, 60 cts.

BRITISH.

Æschylus. *Eumenides*. By John F. Davies. A critical edition, with metrical English translation. 8vo. *Longmans*. 7s.

Cervantes' *Don Quixote*. Translation, introduction and notes, by John Ormsby. 4 vols. Vol. 3. 8vo, 420 pp. *Smith & Elder*. 12s. 6d.

Corneille. *Le Cid*. Edit., with introduction and notes, by Léon Delbos. (French Classics for English Students, No. 5.) Cr. 8vo. *Williams & Norgate*. 1s. 6d.

East Africa. A Pocket Vocabulary of the Ki-Swahili, Ki-Nyika, Ki-Taita, and Ki-Kamba Languages. Compiled by the Rev. A. Downes Shaw. Also a Brief Vocabulary of the Kibwyo Dialect. Collected by the Ven. Archdeacon Farler. 18mo. *S. P. C. K.* 6s.

Euripides. *Andromache*. With brief English notes by F. A. Paley. (Cambridge Texts.) 12mo, 88 pp. *Whittaker*. 1s. 6d.

— *Iphigenia in Tauris*. Edit., with introduction, notes and critical appendix, by C. S. Jerram. 12mo, 184 pp. *Frowde*. 3s.

Fasnacht (G. E.) *Progressive German Reader*. 1. First Year. 12mo, 230 pp. *Macmillan*. 2s. 6d.

Hugo (Victor). *Les Misérables*. *Les Principaux Episodes*. Edited, with life and notes, by J. Boiello. Cr. 8vo. *Williams & Norgate*. 3s. 6d.

Lane (Edward William). *Arabic-English Lexicon*. Ed. by Stanley Lane-Poole. Book 1, Part 7. 4to, cloth. *Williams & Norgate*. 25s.

Molière. *Les Précieuses Ridicules*. Edited, with introduction and notes, by Léon Delbos, M. A., of King's College. Cr. 8vo. *Williams & Norgate*. 1s. 6d.

Müller (F. Max). *Sacred Books of the East*. Vols. 20, 22, 24. Vinaya texts, trans. from the Pāli by T. W. Rhys Davids and Hermann Oldenburg, Pt. 3; Pahlavi texts, trans. by E. W. West, Pt. 3; Gāyā Lūtras, trans. from the Prakrit by Hermann Jacobi, Pt. 1. 8vo. *Frowde*. Each, 10s. 6d.

Plutarch's *Lives of the Gracchi*. With introduction, notes and lexicon by H. A. Holden. 12mo, 260 pp. *Cambridge Warehouse*. 6s.

Sappho. *Memoir, Text, Selected Renderings, and a Literal Translation*, by Henry Thornton Wharton. Post 8vo, parchment. *Stock*. 7s. 6d.

Schrader (Prof.) *The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*. By Dr. Eberh. Schrader. Trans. from the second enlarged German edition, with additions by the author, and an introduction by the Rev. Owen C. Whitehouse, M. A. Vol. I, with map. 8vo. *Williams & Norgate*. 10s. 6d.

Socin (A.) *Arabic Grammar, Paradigms, Literature, Chrestomathy and Glossary*. Translated into English. Cr. 8vo. *Williams & Norgate*. 7s. 6d.

Song (The) *Celestial; or Bhagavad-Gītā*. Trans. from the Sanskrit by Edwin Arnold. Post 8vo, 162 pp. *Trübner*. 5s.

Sophocles, *Œdipus Tyrannus*. Edited for the use of schools by B. H. Kennedy. Post 8vo, 209 pp. *Bell & Sons*. 5s.

Thucydides, *Easy Selections from*. By E. H. Moore. With maps. Cr. 8vo, 190 pp. *Rivingtons*. 3s. 6d.

Tien (Rev. Anton). *Manual of Colloquial Arabic*. 12mo, 420 pp. *W. H. Allen*. 7s. 6d.

Tukudh: *The Book of Common Prayer in the Tukudh Dialect*. Fcap 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Way (Arthur S.) *The Iliad of Homer done into English Verse*. Books 1 to 6. Sm. 4to, 162 pp. *Low*. 5s.

Zimshian: *The Gospel of St. Matthew in the Zimshian Dialect*. Cr. 8vo. *S. P. C. K.*

FRENCH.

Adam (L.) Grammaire de la langue jâgane. In-8. *Maisonneuve*. 2 fr. 50.
 Bonnange (Mme. Marie). Les Homonymes français, accompagnés d'applications. Livre de l'élève. In-8. *Bernard*. 6 fr.

Fabre d'Envieu (J.) Le Dictionnaire allemand enseigné par l'analyse étymologique des noms propres. Avec des appendices et des aperçus nouveaux relatifs à la toponomastique des Celtes. In-12. Toulouse, *Thorin*. 5 fr.

Godefroy (F.) Grammaire française. Cours supérieur. In-12. *Gaume*. Cart., 1 fr. 80.

Goethe. Götz von Berlichingen. Avec une introduction et des notes par Ernest Lichtenberger. Gr. in-8. *Hachette*. 10 fr.

Imitatio Christi, nunc primum ex latino in chaldaicum translata. In-12. *Maisonneuve*. 10 fr.

Kerckhoffs (Aug.) La Langue commerciale universelle (Volapük). In-8. *Le Soudier*. 1 fr. 50.

Le Héricher (E.) Glossaire étymologique anglo-normand. Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 7 fr. 50.

Menant (J.) Les Langues perdues de la Perse et de l'Assyrie. Perse. In-16. *Leroux*. 5 fr. Forme le tome 41 de la *Bibliothèque orientale elzévirienne*.

Nicolas (J.-B.) Dictionnaire français-persan. Tome I, A-K. In-12. *Maisonneuve*. Cart., 15 fr.

Nova (Pierre). Dictionnaire de terminologie scolastique. In-12. Avignon, *Lecoffre*. 4 fr.

Pey (Alexandre). Langue allemande. Cours supérieur. Première partie: Enseignement. In-12. *Delagrave*. Cart., 2 fr. 75.

Saussure (Th. de). Étude sur la langue française. De l'orthographe des noms propres et des mots étrangers introduits dans la langue. In-8. Genève, *Fischbacher*. 3 fr. 50.

Siḥṭūya. Le Livre de Siḥawaihi. Traité de grammaire arabe. Texte arabe, par Hartwig Derenbourg. Tome II, première partie. Gr. in-8. *Maisonneuve*. 15 fr.

Trois nouvelles chinoises, traduites pour la première fois, par M. le marquis d'Hervey-Saint-Denys. In-16. *Leroux*. 2 fr. 50.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen d. archäologisch-epigraphischen Seminars der Universität Wien, hrsg. v. O. Benndorf u. O. Hirschfeld. V. gr. 8. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn*. m. 5. Inhalt: Die Fahnen in römischen Heere von Alfr. v. Domaszewsky. Mit 100 Abbildgn. 80 S.

Abhandlungen, germanistische, hrsg. v. Karl Weinhold. V. gr. 8. Breslau, *Koebner*. m. 5. Inhalt: Der Infinitiv in den Epen Hartmanns v. Aue. Von Dr. Sylvius v. Monsterberg-Münckenaue. vi, 175 S.

Ahlwardt (W.) Kurzes Verzeichniss der Landberg'schen Sammlung arabischer Handschriften auf der königl. Bibliothek zu Berlin. gr. 8, xii, 107 S. Berlin, *Asher & Co.* m. 3.

Albrecht (Auguste). Vocabulaire systématique français et allemand contenant des mots rares et importants. 8, vi, 202 S. Leipzig, *Strauch*. m. 2.25.

Althaus (Carl). Warum erlernt man die alten Sprachen? gr. 8, 20 S. Spandau, *Neugebauer*. m. —40.

Altner (Eug.) Üb. die Chastiments in den altfranzösischen Chansons de geste. Diss. gr. 8, 86 S. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.60.

Aly (F.) Zur Quellenkritik d. älteren Plinius. gr. 4, 21 S. Marburg, *Elwert's Verl. in Comm.* m. —80.

Anzeiger, bibliographischer, f. romanische Sprachen. u. Literaturen, hrsg. v. Dr. Emil Ebeling. 3 Bd., 1885, 6 Hfte. gr. 8, 1 u. 2 Hft. 80 S. Leipzig, *E. Tzietmeyer*. m. 12.

Arago (François). Notices biographiques choisies [éloges]. 3 Bd. Fresnel. Malus. Erklärt v. A. Dronke u. F. W. Röhr. gr. 8, iv, 96 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 1. (1-3, m. 3.10.)

Aristotelis de arte poetica liber, tertiis curis recognovit et adnotatione critica auxit Johs. Vahlen. gr. 8, xxix, 298 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. m. 5.

— ars rhetorica. Cum nova codicis A^c et vetustae translationis collatione ed. Adph. Roemer. 8, xxxvi, 237 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 2.10.

Arriani Nicomediensis scripta minora, Rud. Hercher iterum recognovit, edenda curavit Alfr. Eberhard. 8, lxxvi, 156 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 1.80.

Ausgaben u. Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der romanischen Philologie. Veröffentlicht v. E. Stengel. XXV, XXVII-XXXVI. gr. 8. Marburg, *Elwert's Verl.* m. 24.10. Inhalt: XXV. Ueber die Handschriften d. altfranzösischen Romans Partonopeus de Blois v. Ernst Pfeiffer. Mit Nachschrift u. 2 Anhängen v. E. Stengel. 90 S. m. 1.60.—XXVII. Adam de la Hale's Dramen u. das "Jus du pelerin." Von Leop. Bahlisen. 230 S. m. 5.40.—XXVIII. Alexandre Hardy's Einfluss auf Pierre Corneille. Von Curt Nagel. 36 S. 1884. m. 1.—XXIX. Ueber den Stil v. Guillaume de Lorris u. Jean de Meung. Von Fritz Heinrich. 54 S. m. 1.20.—XXX. Futur u. Conditional II. im Altprovenzalischen. Von Carl Fr. Wolff. 46 S. m. 1.20.—XXXI. Ueber die Vengeance Fromondin, die allein in Hs. Ma erhaltene Fortsetzung der Chanson de Girbert de Mez. Von Alfr. Rudolph. 44 S. m. 1.20.—XXXII. Die Verfasser der altfranzösischen Chanson de geste Aye d'Avignon. Von Rud. Oesten. 51 S. m. 1.20.—XXXIII. Untersuchungen üb. die Verfasser der Miracles de Nostre Dame par personnages. Von Herm. Schnell. 74 S. m. 2.—XXXIV. Die Tiere im altfranzösischen Epos. Von Frdr. Bangert. 224 S. m. 6.—XXXV. Lautliche Untersuchung der Miracles de St. Eloi. Von Emil Wirtz. 104 S. m. 2.50.—XXXVI. Guillem Anelier v. Toulouse, der Dichter d. 2 Theils der Albigenserchronik. Von Rud. Diehl. 42 S. m. —80.

— XXXVIII. Versuch e. Dialektbestimmung d. Lai du corn u. d. Fabliau du mantel mautaillié. Von Paul Richter. 44 S. m. 1.20.

Autolyçi de sphaera quae movetur liber, ed., latina interpretatione et commentariis instruxit Frdr. Hulsch. 8, lxiv, 231 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 3.60.

Baumgartner (Adf.) Dr. M. Lauer u. das 2 Buch d. Möses Chorenazi. gr. 8, 24 S. Leipzig, *Staufer in Comm.* m. 1.50.

Baunack (Johs.) u. Baunack (Thdr.) Die Inschrift v. Gortyn. Mit 1 Taf. gr. 8, viii, 167 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. m. 4.

Beer (Rud.) Spicilegium Juvenalianum. Accessit libri Pithoeani simulacrum (photolith.) gr. 8, 82 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 2.80.

Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen, hrsg. v. Dr. Adb. Bez-

zenberger. 10 bd. 4 hfte. gr. 8, 1 u. 2 Hft. 204 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl.* m. 10.

Below (Erich). De hiatu Plautino quaestionum I pars, qua agitur de hiatu qui fit in thesi. gr. 8, 94 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 2.40.

Bersu (Phpp.) Die Gutturalen u. ihre Verbindung mit *v* im Lateinischen. Gekrönte Preisschrift. gr. 8, vi, 234 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 5.

Bibliotheca normannica. Denkmäler normann. Literatur u. Sprache, hrsg. v. Herm. Suchier. III. gr. 8. Halle, *Niemeyer.* m. 10. (1-3, m. 18.50.) Inhalt: Die Lais der Marie de France, hrsg. v. Karl Warnke. Mit vergleich. Anmerkgn. v. Rhold. Köhler. viii, cviii, 276 S.

Bibliothek der ältesten deutschen Litteratur-Denkmäler. 1 Bd. gr. 8. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh.* m. 5. Inhalt: Frdr. Ludw. Stamm's Ulfilas od. die uns erhaltenen Denkmäler der goth. Sprache. Text, Wörterbuch u. Grammatik. Neu hrsg. v. Mor. Heyne. 8 Aufl. xii, 432 S.

Bibliothek, altenglische, hrsg. v. Eug. Kölbing. 3 Bd. 8. Heilbronn, *Henninger.* m. 4.50. Inhalt: Octavian. Zwei mittellengl. Bearbeitgn. der Sage, hrsg. v. Greg. Sarrazin. xlv, 191 S.

Blass (Frdr.) Die socialen Zustände Athens im 4 Jahrh. v. Chr. gr. 8, 20 S. Kiel, *Universitäts-Buchh.* m. 1.

Bobrik (R.) Horaz. Entdeckungen u. Forschungen. 1 Tl. hoch 4, vi, 498 S. Leipzig, *Teubner in Comm.* m. 28.

Boldt (Heinr.) De liberiore linguae graecae et latinae collocatione verborum capita selecta. Diss. gr. 8, 195 S. Göttingen, *Deuerlich,* 1884. m. 2.40.

Boltz (Aug.) Die Kyklopen, e. historisches Volk. Sprachlich nachgewiesen. 8, vi, 36 S. Berlin, *Gaertner.* m. 1.

Braun (Rhoid.) Beiträge zur Statistik d. Sprachgebrauchs Sallusts im Catilina u. Jugurtha. gr. 8, 68 S. Düsseldorf. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 1.

Breymann (Herm.) Wünsche u. Hoffnungen, betr. das Studium der neueren Sprachen an Schule u. Universität. gr. 8, vii, 52 S. München, *Oldenbourg.* m. 1.20.

Bruchmann (Karl). De Apolline et graeca Minerva deis medicis. Diss. gr. 8, 79 S. Breslau, *Köhler.* m. 1.

Brugmann (Karl). Zum heutigen Stand der Sprachwissenschaft. gr. 8, 144 S. Strassburg, *Trübner.* m. 2.50.

Brugsch (Henri) et Dümichen (J.) Recueil de monuments égyptiens. 5 partie. cart. 4. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 60. (1-5, m. 2.30.) Inhalt: Geographische Inschriften altägyptischer Denkmäler, hrsg. v. Johs. Dümichen. 3 Abth. 96 einfache u. 2 (autogr.) Doppeltaf. 12 S.

Byron (Lord). Childe Harold's pilgrimage. A romaunt. Erklärt v. Aug. Mommsen. gr. 8, xxxvi, 367 S. Berlin, *Weidmann.* m. 3.

Caesii Bassi, Atilii Fortunatiani de metris libri, ad fidem codicis Neapolitani rec. Henr. Keil. gr. 8, vii, 44 S. Halis Sax. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 1.60.

Calpurnii et Nemesiani Bucolica, rec. Henr. Schenkl. gr. 8, lxxii, 130 S. Prag, *Tempusky.* Leipzig, *Freytag.* m. 6.

Carrionis (Lud.) In A. Gellii Noctium Atticarum libros commentarios qui extant castigationum et notarum specimen ex ed. princ. a Mart. Hertz depromptum. 4, 17 S. Breslau, *Köhler.* m. 1.

Catulli Veronensis liber. Recensuit et interpretatus est Aemilius Baehrens.

Vol. II commentarium continentis fasc. I. gr. 8, 320 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 6.40. (I u. II, I, m. 10.40.)

Cauer (Paul). Zum Verständniß der nachahmenden Kunst d. Vergil. 4. 26 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. m. 1.

Ciceronis (M. Tulli). Libri qui ad rem publicam et ad philosophiam spectant, scholarum in usum ed. Thdr. Schiche. Vol. X. De officiis libri III. 8, xii, 119 S. Leipzig, *Freytag*. m. —80.

Collitz (Herm.) Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der griechischen Dialekte m. besond. Rücksicht auf die thessalische Mundart. gr. 8, 16 S. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verl.* m. —60.

Cueppers (Frz. Jos.) De octavo Thucydidis libro non perpolitato. Commentatio philologica. gr. 8, 67 S. Monasterii Guestf., 1884. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.50.

Damsté (P. H.) Adversaria critica ad C. Valerii Flacci Argonautica. gr. 8, 55 S. Lugduni Batavorum. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 2.

Delitzsch (Frdr.) Assyrische Lesestücke. 3 durchaus neu bearb. Aufl. Fol., xvi, 148 S., wovon 136 autogr., cart. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 30.

Demosthenis orationes ex recensione Guil. Dindorfii. Vol. I. Orationes I–XIX. Ed. IV correctior curante Frid. Blass. Ed. maior. 8, clxxvi, 444 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 2.40.

— Vol. I. Ed. minor. 8, iii, 444 S. Ebd. m. 1.50.

Denk (Otto). Die Verwelschung der deutschen Sprache. 8, 42 S. Gütersloh, *Bertelsmann*. m. —60.

Dissertationes philologicae Argentoratenses selectae. Vol. IX. gr. 8, iii, 396 S. Strassburg, *Trübner*. m. 7.

Dorfeld (Carl). Üb. die Function d. Präfixes ge-[got. ga-] in der Composition m. Verben. 1 Tl. Das Präfix bei Ulfilas u. Tatian. Diss. gr. 8, 47 S. Giessen. Halle, *Niemeyer*. m. 1.50.

Drachman (Bernard). Die Stellung u. Bedeutung d. Jehuda Hajjug in der Geschichte der hebräischen Grammatik. gr. 8, vii, 79 S. Breslau, *Preuss & Jünger*. m. 3.

Droysen (Hans). Untersuchungen üb. Alexander d. Grossen Heerwesen u. Kriegführung. gr. 8, 78 S. Freiburg i. Br., *Mohr*. m. 2.

Droz (Th.) L'esprit gaulois dans la littérature française. gr. 8, 42 S. Zürich, *Meyer & Zeller*. m. —80.

Dümichen (Johs.) Der Grabpalast d. Patuamenap in der thebanischen Nekropolis. 2 Abth. iii, 56 S., m. 29 autogr. Taf., cart. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 60. 1 u. 2, m. 110.

Dvořák (Rud.) Üb. die Fremdwörter im Korân. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 84 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. 1.30.

Elster (Ernst). Beiträge zur Kritik d. Lohengrin. [Aus "Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache u. Literatur."] gr. 8, iii, 114 S. Halle, *Niemeyer*, 1884. m. 3.

Elze (Karl). A letter to C. M. Ingleby, containing notes and conjectural emendations on Shakespeare's Cymbeline. gr. 8, 37 S. Halle, *Niemeyer* m. 1.20; geb., m. 1.80.

Ephemeris epigraphica, corporis inscriptionum latinarum supplementum, edita jussu instituti archaeologici romani cura G. Henzen, Th. Mommseni, I.

B. Rossii. Vol. VI. gr. 8. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. m. 8. Inhalt: Glandes plumbeae, editae ab Carolo Zangemeister. Accedunt tabulae heliotypicae XIII. xlvī, 143 S.

Euclidis opera omnia. Edd. I. L. Heiberg et H. Menge. Vol. IV. Elementa. Ed. et latine interpretatus est I. L. Heiberg. Vol. IV. Libros XI-XIII, continens. 8, vi, 423 S., with figures. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 4.50. (I, II et IV, m. 12.60.)

Euripides, ausgewählte Tragödien. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. N. Wecklein. 4 Bdchn. Hippolytos. gr. 8, 129 S. m. 1 Taf. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 1.50. (1-4, m. 6.30.)

Fernow (Hans). The three Lords and three Ladies of London. By R[obert] W[ilson]. London, 1590. gr. 4, 29 S. Hamburg, *Nolte*. m. 1.50.

Fick (Wilh.) Zum mittellenglischen Gedicht v. der Perle. Eine Lautuntersuchg. gr. 8, 42 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. m. 1.20.

Flach (Hans). Peisistratos u. seine litterarische Thätigkeit. gr. 8, 42 S. Tübingen, *Fues*. m. 1.20.

Fleischer (H. L.) Kleinere Schriften. Gesammelt, durchgesehen u. verm. 1 Bd. 2 Thle. gr. 8, iv, 844 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. m. 24.

Frigell (Andr.) Prolegomena in T. Livii librum XXIII. gr. 8, 72 S. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes*. m. 1.20.

Friis (J. A.) Lexicon lapponicum cum interpretatione latina et norvegica, adjuncta brevi grammaticae lapponicae adumbratione. In 5 Fasc. Fasc. 1. Lex.-8, 160 S. Christiania, *Dybwad*. m. 4.

Gelzer (Heinr.) Sextus Julius Africanus u. die byzantinische Chronographie. 2 Thl. 1 Abth. gr. 8, viii, 425 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 12.80. (I u. II, 1. m. 20.80.)

Gerber (Gust.) Die Sprache als Kunst. 2 Aufl., 3-10 (Schluss-)Lfg. gr. 8, 1 Bd. viii u. S. 225-561 u. 2 Bd. iv, 526 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. à m. 2.

Gitlbauer (Mich.) Philologische Streifzüge. 2 u. 3 Lfg. gr. 8, S. 81-240. Freiburg i. Br., *Herder*. à m. 1.60.

Gleisberg (Ewald). Die Historienbibel [Merzdorfs I] u. ihr Verhältnis zur rudolfinischen u. thüringischen Weltchronik. gr. 8, 50 S. Gera. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.20.

Goeders (Chrn.) Zur Analogiebildung im Mittel- u. Neuenglischen. gr. 8, 40 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*, 1884. m. 1.20.

Goetz (Geo.) Meletemata Festina. gr. 4, 8 S. Jena, *Neuenhahn*. m. —60.

Gutsche (W. Otto). De interrogationibus obliquis apud Ciceronem observationes selectae. Diss. gr. 8, 112 S. Halis Sax. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.80.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung m. besond. Rücksicht auf Geschichte u. Methodik der einzelnen Disciplinen. In Verbindg. m. Autenrieth, Ad. Bauer, Blass, etc., hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. Iwan Müller. In 14 Halbbdn. 1 Halbbd. gr. 8, 2 Bd. xii u. S. 1-288. Nördlingen, *Beck*. m. 5.50.

Heidtmann (G.) Emendationen zu Vergil's Aeneis Buch I u. IV. gr. 8, viii, 10 S. Coblenz, *Groos*. m. —80.

Hellmers (Gerh.) Üb. die sprache Robert Mannyns of Brunne u. üb. die autorschaft der ihm zugeschriebenen "Meditations on the Supper of our Lord." gr. 8, 96 S. Goslar, *Koch*. m. 2.40.

Herodotos. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. Gymn.-Prof. Dr. J. Sitzler. VII Buch. Ausg. A. Kommentar unterm Text. gr. 8, vi, 177 S. m. 2. Ausg. B. Text u. Kommentar getrennt in 2 Hftn. vi, 82 u. 93 S. Gotha, *F. A. Perthes*. m. 2.

Hesselmeyer (E.) Die Ursprünge der Stadt Pergamos in Kleinasien. Mit zwei Beilagen. gr. 8, v, 46 S. Tübingen, *Fues*. m. 1.20.

Heubach (Herm.) Commentarii et Indicis grammatici ad Iliadis scholia veneta A specimen I. Diss. gr. 8, 67 S. Jena, *Neuenhahn*. m. 2.

Heymann (Paul). In Propertium quaestiones grammaticae et orthographicae. Diss. gr. 8, 87 S. Halis Sax, 1883. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 2.

Hirsch (Paul). Phrygiae de nominibus oppidorum. Diss. gr. 8, 32 S. Königsberg, *Koch & Reimer*, 1884. m. 1.

Hirschfeld (Prof. Gust.) Paphlagonische Felsengräber. Mit 7 Taf. u. 9 Abbildgn. im Text. [Aus "Abhandlg. d. k. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin."] gr. 4, 52 S., cart. Berlin, *Dümmler's Verl.* m. 6.

Holzappel (Ludw.) Römische Chronologie. gr. 8, v, 364 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 8.

Holzweissig (Fr.) Üb. den sociativ-instrumentalen Gebrauch d. griechischen Dativ bei Homer. 4, 24 S. Burg. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.

Horati Flacci (Q.) Opera, scholarum in usum edd. O. Keller et I. Haecussner. 8, xviii, 265 S. Prag, *Tempisky*. Leipzig, *Freytag*. m. 1.

Horatius Flaccus (Q.) Rec. atque interpretatus est Jo. Gasper Orellius. Ed. IV maior, quam post Jo. Geo. Baierum curavit Guil. Hirschfelder. Fasc. 1. gr. 8, 1 Bd. S. 1-160. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* Subscr.-Pr. m. 3.

Hornemann (F.) Zur Reform d. neusprachlichen Unterrichts auf höheren Lehranstalten. gr. 8, iv, 92 S. Hannover, *Meyer*. m. 1.60.

Illing (Carl Emil). De antidosi. gr. 8, 37 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 1.80.

Imhoof-Blumer (F.) Porträtköpfe auf antiken Münzen hellenischer u. hellenisierter Völke Mit 206 Bildnissen in Lichtdr. (auf 8 Taf.) gr. 4, iv, 95 S., cart. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 10.

Institutionum graeca paraphrasis Theophilo antecessori vulgo tributa, rec., prolegomenis, notis criticis instruxit E. C. Ferrini. Accedit epistula C. Zachariae a Lingenthal. Pars II, Fasc. 1. gr. 8, S. 257-320. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 2. (I et II, 1, m. 8.)

— Cum versione latina. Pars II, Fasc. 1. gr. 8. Doppels. 256-304. Ebd. m. 2.40. (I et II, 1, m. 14.40.)

Jaffe (Siegfr.) De personis Horatianis capita III. Diss. gr. 8, 51 S. Halis Sax. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 1.20.

Jahresbericht üb. die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie, hrsg. v. der Gesellschaft f. deutsche Philologie in Berlin. 6 Jahrg. 1884. 2 Abtlg. gr. 8, iv u. S. 129-418. Leipzig, *Reissner*. Nachberechnung, m. 2. (cplt., m. 10.)

Jecht (Rich.) Welche Stellung nimmt der Dialog Parmenides zu der Ideenlehre Platos ein? 4, 21 S. Görlitz, *Tzschaschel*. m. 1.

Jensen (Arth.) Syntactische Studien zu Robert Garnier. gr. 8, 58 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. m. 1.60.

Jeschonnek (Frdr.) De nominibus quae graeci pecudibus domesticis indiderunt. Diss. gr. 8, 65 S. Königsberg, *Koch & Reimer*. m. 1.50.

Jessen (Jul.) Apollonius v. Tyana u. sein Biograph Philostratus. gr. 4, 36 S. Hamburg, *Nolte*. m. 2.50.

Johannssen (Herm.) Der Ausdruck d. Concessivverhältnisses im Altfranzösischen. gr. 8, 70 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. m. 1.80.

Jordan (H.) Quaestiones Theognideae. gr. 4, 16 S. Königsberg, *Hartung*. m. 1.50.

Kaulen (Ferd.) Die Poetik Boileau's. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der französ. Poesie im 17 Jahrh. Diss. gr. 8, v, 128 S. Hannover, 1882. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 2.40.

Kayser (Herm.) Zur Syntax Molière's. gr. 8, 50 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. m. 1.20.

Keintzel (Geo.) Der Heliand im Verhältniss zu seinen Quellen. 4, 36 S. Hermannstadt, 1882. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.

Keinz (Frdr.) Die Gründung d. Klosters Waldsassen. Altdeutsches Gedicht. gr. 8, 22 S. München, *A. Hermann's Nachf.* m. —60.

Kelle (Joh.) Das Verbum u. Nomen in Notker's Boethius. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 90 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. 1.40.

Kirchhoff (Chrn.) Der Rhombus in der Orchestra d. Dionysustheaters zu Athen. 1 dreifarb. Steindr.-Taf. Nebst einigen Bemerkgn. gr. 4, 1 S. Text. Altona, *Schlüter*. m. —60.

Klemenz (Paul). Der syntactische Gebrauch d. Participium Praesentis u. d. Gerundiums im Altfranzösischen. Diss. gr. 8, 46 S. Breslau, *Köhler*, 1884. m. 1.

Koeppel (Emil). Laurents de Premierfait u. John Lydgates Bearbeitungen v. Boccaccios de casibus virorum illustrium. gr. 8, 112 S. München, *Buchholz & Werner*. m. 2.

Kremer, v. Üb. meine Sammlung orientalischer Handschriften. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 78 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. 1.20.

Kühnau (Rich.) De Trishubhjagatica metrorum indicorum gente quaestio rhythmica et historica. Diss. gr. 8, 70 S. m. 3 Tab. Breslau, *Köhler*. m. 1.

Laeger (Otto). De veterum epicorum studio in Archilochi, Simonidis, Solonis, Hipponactis reliquiis conspicuo. Diss. gr. 8, 75 S. Halis Sax. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.20.

Landgraf (Gust.) Die Vita Alexandri Magni d. Archipresbyters Leo [Historia de preliis]. Zum erstenmal hrsg. gr. 8, 140 S. Erlangen, *Deichert*. m. 3.

Lehmann (Hans). Brünne u. Helm im angelsächsischen Beowulf liede. Diss. gr. 8, 31 . 2 autogr. Taf. Leipzig, *Lorents*. m. 2.50.

Lewy (Heinr.) De civili condicione mulierum graecarum. Diss. gr. 8, 69 S. Breslau, *Köhler*. m. 1.

— Altes Stadtrecht v. Gortyn auf Kreta. Nach der v. Halbherr u. Fabricius aufgefundenen Inschrift. Text, Übersetzg. u. Anmerkgn., nebst e. Wörterverzeichnis. gr. 4, 32 S. Berlin, *Gaertner*. m. 2.50.

Lexikon, ausführliches, der griechischen u. römischen Mythologie, im Verein m. Th. Birt, O. Crusius, R. Engelmann, etc., unter Mitred. v. Th. Schreiber hrsg. v. W. H. Roscher. Mit zahlreichen Abbildgn. 6 Lfg. Lex.-8, Sp. 897-1056. Leipzig, *Teubner*. à m. 2.

Lhotzky (Heinr.) Die Annalen Asurnazirpals [884-860 v. Chr.], umschrieben, übers. u. erklärt. Diss. gr. 8, 33 S. München. Leipzig *Fock*. m. 2.

Livi Andronici et Cn. Naevi fabularum reliquiae. Emendavit et adnotavit Lucianus Mueller. gr. 8, 72 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co.* m. 2.

Livi (Titi). Ab urbe condita liber II. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. Frz. Luterbacher. gr. 8, 126 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 1.20.

Loewy (Eman.) Inschriften griechischer Bildhauer, m. Facsimiles hrsg. Gedruckt m. Unterstützg. der kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien. gr. 4, xl, 410 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 20.

Ludwich (Arth.) Aristarchs homerische Textkritik, nach den Fragmenten d. Didymos dargestellt u. beurtheilt. 2 Thl. gr. 8, vi, 774 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 16. (cpl., m. 28.)

Luebbert (Ed.) Commentatio de poesis Pindaricae in archa et sphragide componendis arte. 4 6 S. Bonn, *Cohen & Sohn*. m. 1.

Machnig (Jul.) De oraculo Dodonaeo capita V. Diss. gr. 8, 39 S. Breslau, *Köhler*. m. 1.

Magazin, hrsg. v. der lettisch-literarischen Gesellschaft. 17 Bd. 2 Stück. 8, 341 S. Mitau, *Besthorn*. m. 6.

Marquardt (Joach.) u. Mommsen (Thdr.) Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer. 6 Bd. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. m. 11. Inhalt: Römische Staatsverwaltung v. Joach. Marquardt. 3 Bd. 2 Aufl. Besorgt v. Geo. Wissowa. xii, 598 S.

Meifart (Theophilus). De futuri exacti usu Plautino. Diss. gr. 8, 28 S. Jena, *Neuenhahn*. m. 1.

Meisterhans (K.) Grammatik der attischen Inschriften. gr. 8, ix, 119 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 4.

Mélanges gréco-romains tirés du Bulletin de l'académie impériale des sciences de St.-Petersbourg. Tome V, Livr. 2. Lex.-8, S. 93-252. St.-Petersbourg. Leipzig, *Voss' Sort.* m. 1.30. (1 et 2, m. 2.30.)

Meltzer (Otto). De belli punici secundi primordiis adversariorum capita IV. gr. 4, 30 S. Berlin, *Weidmann*. m. 1.20.

Merguet (H.) Lexikon zu den Schriften Cäsars u. seiner Fortsetzer m. Angabe sämtlicher Stellen. 2 Lfg. Lex.-8, S. 145-304. Jena, *Fischer*. (à) m. 8.

Meusel (H.) Lexicon Caesarianum. Fasc. 2 et 3. Lex.-8, Sp. 193-576. Berlin, *W. Weber*. m. 2.40.

Mittheilungen, archäologisch-epigraphische, aus Oesterreich, hrsg. v. O. Benndorf, O. Hirschfeld, E. Bormann. 9 Jahrg. 1885. gr. 8, 1 Hft. 144 S. m. 4 Taf. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. 9.

Mittheilungen d. deutschen archäologischen Institutes in Athen. 10 Bd. 4 Hfte. gr. 8, 1 Hft. 80 S. m. eingedr. Holzschn. u. 3 Taf. Athen, *Wilberg in Comm.* m. 15.

Müller (D. H.) Vier palmyrenische Grabinschriften. Mit 1 (Lichtdr.-) Taf. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 7 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. —60.

Müller (Lucian). Metrik der Griechen u. Römer. 2 Ausg. gr. 8, xii, 86 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. geb. m. 1.50.

— Der saturnische Vers u. seine Denkmäler. gr. 8, viii, 175 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 4.

Museum, rheinisches, f. Philologie. Hrsg. v. Otto Ribbeck u. Frz. Bücheler. Neue Folge. 40 Bd. Ergänzungsheft. gr. 8. Frankfurt a. M., *Sauerländer*. m. 4. Inhalt: Das Recht v. Gortyn, hrsg. u. erläutert v. Frz. Bücheler u. Ernst Zitelmann. x, 180 S.

Neumann (Emil). De compositorum a dis [di] incipientium apud priscos scriptores vi et usu. Diss. gr. 8, 36 S. Jena, *Neuenhahn*. m. 1.50.

Obhlidal (M.) Unterrichts-Briefe zur Erlernung der Weltsprache Volapük. 3 Ausg. 8, 95 S. Wien, *Kravani*. m. —75.

Oesterlen (Thdr.) Studien zu Vergil u. Horaz. gr. 8, vii, 104 S. Tübingen, *Fues*. m. 2.40.

Ohnesorge (Wilh.) Der Anonymus Valesii de Constantino. Diss. gr. 8, 112 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. m. 2.60.

Oppert (Jul.) Die astronomischen Angaben der assyrischen Keilinschriften. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 13 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn*. m. —30.

Oppian's d. Jüngern Gedicht v. der Jagd in 4 Büchern. 1 Buch, metrisch übers. u. m. erklär. Bemerkgn. versehen v. Max Miller. gr. 8, 61 S. Amberg, *Habbel*. m. 1.20.

Orphica. Rec. Eug. Abel. Accedunt Procli hymni, hymni magici, hymnus in Isim, aliaque eiusmodi carmina. 8, iii, 320 S. Prag, *Tempisky*. Leipzig, *Freytag*. m. 5.

Ovidius Naso (P.) Ausgewählte Gedichte, m. Erläutergn. f. den Schulgebrauch v. Sem.-Oberlehr. Dr. Herm. Günther. gr. 8, xvi, 128 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 1.50.

Panaetii et Hecatonis librorum fragmenta, collegit, praefationibus illustravit Haroldus N. Fowler. Diss. gr. 8, 63 S. Bonn, *Cohen & Sohn*. m. 1.50.

Panofsky (Hugo). De historiae Herodoteae fontibus. gr. 8, 69 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*, 1884. m. 1.60.

Peine (Selmar). De ornamentis triumphalibus. gr. 8, 85 S. Berlin, *Calvary & Co*. m. 3.50.

Pfizmaier (A.) Darlegungen grönländischer Verbalformen. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 82 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. 1.20.

— Erklärung d. Tagebuches Idzmi-Siki-Bu. [Aus "Denkschr. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Imp.-4, 98 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. 4.80.

— Die Oertlichkeiten v. Ômi u. Mino. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 82 S. Ebd. m. 1.20.

Platon's ausgewählte Schriften. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt v. Chrn. Cron u. Jul. Deuschle. 5 Tl. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 3. Inhalt: Symposium, erklärt v. Arnold Hug. 2 Aufl. lxvii, 232 S.

Plauti fabularum deperditarum fragmenta, collegit Dr. Frz. Winter. gr. 8, 99 S. Bonn, *Cohen & Sohn*. m. 2.80.

Pohler (Johs.) Diodoros als Quelle zur Geschichte v. Hellas in der Zeit v. Thebens Aufschwung u. Grösse. [379–362.] gr. 8, 84 S. Kassel, *Kessler*. m. 2.

Printzen (W.) Marivaux. Sein Leben, seine Werke u. seine litterar. Bedeutg. Diss. gr. 8, 123 S. Münster. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 2.

Prinzhorn (Wilh.) De libris Terentianis, quae ad recensionem Calliopianam redeunt. gr. 8, 38 S. Göttingen, *Spielmeier*. m. 1.

Psalterium, das tironische, der Wolfenbütteler Bibliothek. Hrsg. vom königl. stenograph. Institut zu Dresden. Mit e. Einleitg. u. Übertragg. d. tiron. Textes. v. Osk. Lehmann. gr. 8, iv, 208 S. u. 120 autogr. Doppels. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 10.

Rājaçekhara, Pracandapāṇḍava. Ein Drama, zum ersten Male hrsg. v. Carl Cappeller. gr. 8, ix, 50 S. Strassburg, *Trübner*. m. 3.50.

Reifferscheid (A.) Quaestiones syntacticae. Schedae Basilicae. 4, 11 S. Breslau, *Köhler*. m. 1.

Reinisch (Leo.) Die Quarasprache in Abessinien. II. Textproben. [Aus "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 152 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. 2.40. (I u. II, m. 6.)

Ribbeck (Otto). Agroikos. Eine etholog. Studie. [Aus "Abhandlgn. d. k. sächs. Gesellsch. d. Wiss."] Lex.-8, 68 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. m. 2.

Rockel (Karl Johs.) De allocutionis usu, qualis sit apud Thucydidem, Xenophontem, Oratores Atticos, Dionem, Aristidem. Diss. gr. 8, 56 S. Königsberg, *Koch & Reimer*, 1884. m. 1.

Rohden (Paul v.) De Palaestina et Afabia provinciis romanis quaestiones selectae. Diss. gr. 8, 57 S. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 1.20.

Rosbach (Aug.) u. Westphal (Rud.) Theorie der musischen Künste der Hellenen. Als 3 Aufl. der Rosbach-Westphalschen Metrik. 1 Bd. gr. 8. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 7.20. Inhalt: Griechische Rhythmik. Von Prof. a. D. Dr. Rud. Westphal. Als 3 Aufl. der griech. Rhythmik u. der Fragmente u. Lehrsätze der griech. Rhythmiker. xl, 305 S.

Saalfeld (G. A.) Wegweiser auf dem Gebiete der Eigennamen [deutsch-lateinisch u. lateinisch-deutsch] aus der alten, mittleren u. neuen Geographie etc. 8, iv, 146 S. Leipzig, *C. F. Winter*. m. —60.

Sachau (E.) Kurzes Verzeichniss der Sachau'schen Sammlung syrischer Handschriften auf der königl. Bibliothek zu Berlin. gr. 8, xxviii, 35 S. Berlin, *Asher & Co.* m. 2.

Schäfer (Ernst). Nepos-Vokabular. 1 Tl. gr. 8, vi, 38 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. cart. m. —40.

Schmidt (Herm.) Das Pronomen bei Molière im Vergleich zu dem heutigen u. dem altfranzösischen Sprachgebrauch. gr. 8, 58 S. Kiel, *Lipsius & Tischer*. m. 1.60.

Schneege (Gerhard). De relatione historica, quae intercedat inter Thucydidem et Herodotum. Diss. gr. 8, 60 S. Breslau, *Köhler*, 1884. m. 1.

Schultze (Th.) Das Dhammapada. Aus der engl. Uebersetzg. Sacred books of the East, Vol. X, metrisch ins Deutsche übertragen. Mit Erläutergn. gr. 8, xix, 123 S. Leipzig, *O. Schulze*. m. 2.50.

Sepp (Dr. Bernh.) Incerti auctoris liber de origine gentis romanae [fragmentum], ad fidem codicis Bruxellensis, qui exstat unicus, denuo rec. B. S. gr. 8, xv, 48 S. Eichstätt, *Stilkrauth*. m. 1.60.

Socin (A.) Arabic grammar. Paradigms, literature, chrestomathy and glossary. [Porta linguarum orientalium. Pars 4, ed. 3.] 8, xvi, 191 S. Karlsruhe, *Reuther*. m. 7.

— Arabische Grammatik. Paradigmen, Litteratur, Chrestomathie u.

Glossar. [Porta linguarum orientalium. Pars IV, 3 ed.] 8, xvi, 194 S. Ebd. m. 6.

Steigemann (Herm.) De Polybii olympiadum ratione et oeconomia. Diss. gr. 8, 54 S. Svidnicia. Breslau, *Köhler*. m. 1.

Steindorff (Geo.) Prolegomena zu e. koptischen Nominalclasse. Diss. gr. 4, 16 autogr. S. Berlin, 1884. Leipzig, *Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 2.

Steinitz (Siegfr.) De affirmandi particulis latinis. I. Profecto. Diss. gr. 8, 56 S. Breslau, *Köhler*. m. 1.

Stenzler (A. F.) Elementarbuch der Sanskrit-Sprache. Grammatik, Text, Wörterbuch. 5 verb. Aufl. gr. 8, iv, 127 S. Breslau, *Köhler*. m. 4.

Strecker (Carl). De Lycophrone, Euphronio, Eratosthene comicorum interpretibus. Diss. gr. 8, 86 S. Gryphiswaldiae, 1884. Leipzig, *Fock*. m. 1.50.

Studien, Leipziger, zur classischen Philologie, hrsg. v. G. Curtius, L. Lange, O. Ribbeck, H. Lipsius. 8 Bd. 1 Hft. gr. 8, 170 S. Leipzig, *Hirzel*. m. 4.

Taciti (Cornelii). De origine, situ, moribus ac populis Germanorum liber. In usum scholarum ed. Joa. Müller. 8, vii, 27 S. Leipzig, *Freitag*. m. —30.

Therianos (Dionys.) Philologische Aufzeichnungen. (Griechisch.) 8, v, 387 S. Triest, *Schimpff*. m. 5.

Tichelmann (Ludw.) De versibus ionicis a minore apud poetas graecos obviis. Diss. gr. 8, 64 S. Königsberg, *Gräfe & Unzer*, 1884. m. 1.

Türk (Mor.) De Propertii carminum quae pertinent ad antiquitatem romanam auctoribus. Diss. gr. 8, 64 S. Halis Sax. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. m. 1.20.

Turneysen (Rud.) Der Saturnier u. sein Verhältniss zum späteren römischen Volksverse untersucht. gr. 8, iii, 63 S. Halle, *Niemeyer*. m. 1.60.

Vambéry (Herm.) Die Scheibaniade. Ein özbegisches Heldengedicht in 76 Gesängen v. Prinz Mohammed Salih aus Charezm. Text, Übersetzg. u. Noten. Lex.-8, xxi, 468 S. Budapest, *Kilidi in Comm.* m. 30.

Vegeti Rēnati, Flavi, epitoma rei militaris. Rec. Carol. Lang. Ed. II. 8, li, 256 S. Leipzig, *Teubner*. m. 3.90.

Vrba (Karl Frz.) Meletemata Porphyrianea. gr. 8, 70 S. Wien, *Gerold's Sohn in Comm.* m. 2.

Waller (Wilh.) Excursus criticus in P. Papinii Statii Silvas. Diss. gr. 8, 58 S. Breslau, *Köhler*. m. 1.

Waltemath (Wilh.) Die fränkischen Elemente in der französischen Sprache. gr. 8, 106 S. Paderborn, *F. Schöningh*. m. 1.20.

Wania (Frz.) Das Praesens historicum in Caesars Bellum gallicum. gr. 8, 114 S. Wien, *Pichler's Wwe. & Sohn*. m. 1.50.

Wegener (Ph.) Untersuchungen üb. die Grundfragen d. Sprachlebens. gr. 8, viii, 208 S. Halle, *Niemeyer*. m. 5.

Wenzel (Guido). Aesthetische u. sprachliche Studien üb. Antoine de Montchrétien im Vergleich zu seinen Zeitgenossen. Diss. gr. 8, 101 S. Weimar. Jena, *Deistung*. m. 1.60.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulr. v.) Lectiones epigraphicae. 4, 17 S. Göttingen, *Dieterich's Verl.* m. —80.

Wilcken (Ulr.) *Observationes ad historiam Aegypti provinciae romanae depromptae e papyris graecis Berolinensibus ineditis.* Diss. gr. 8, 59 S., of which 27 autogr. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller.* m. 2.40.

Wutke (Rob.) *Quaestiones Caesarianae.* Ed. II. gr. 8, 16 S. Neisse, *Graveur's Verl.* m. 1.

Zarncke (Ed.) *Symbolae ad Julii Pollucis tractatum de partibus corporis humani.* gr. 8, 76 S. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 1.60.

Zehetmayr (Sebastian). *Die analog vergleichende Etymologie, in Beispielen erläutert. Wort-Register.* gr. 8, 15 S. Freising. Leipzig, *Brockhaus' Sort.* m. 1. (Hauptwerk m. Reg., m. 2.)

Zeitschrift f. romanische Philologie. Hrsg. v. Prof. Dr. Gust. Gröber. 1885. 9 Bd. gr. 8, 1 Hft. 160 S. Halle, *Niemeyer.* m. 20.

Zeitschrift f. vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der indogermanischen Sprachen. Begründet v. A. Kuhn. Hrsg. v. E. Kuhn u. J. Schmidt. 28 Bd. Neue Folge 8 Bd. 6 Hfte. gr. 8, 1 u. 2 Hft. 216 S. Berlin, *Dümmler's Verl.* m. 16.

Zieliński (Th.) *Die Gliederung der altattischen Komödie.* gr. 8, viii, 398 S. m. 1 Chromolith. Leipzig, *Teubner.* m. 10.

Ziemann (Frz.) *De anathematis graecis.* Diss. gr. 8, 60 S. Königsberg, *Koch & Reimer.* m. 1.20.

Zutavern (Karl). *Üb. die altfranzösische epische Sprache.* I. gr. 8, 80 S. Heidelberg, *Weiss' Sort.* m. 1.60.

ITALIAN.

Rossi (F.) *Trascrizione di alcuni testi copti tratti dai papiri del Museo egizio di Torino. Con traduzione italiane e note.* 4to, 95 pp. con 2 Tav. Torino, 1884. l. 10.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Adam (Lucien). *Le Taensa a-t-il été forgé de toutes pièces. Réponse à M. Daniel G. Brinton.* Paris, *Maisonneuve Frères*, 1885.

Altenglische Bibliothek. Herausg. von Eugen Kölbing. Dritter Band. Octavian. Zwei mittellenglische Bearbeitungen der Sage. Herausg. von Gregor Sarrazin. Heilbronn, *Gebr. Henninger*, 1885. 4 m. 50 pf.

Andocides, de Mysteriis. Ed. with critical and explanatory notes, by W. J. Hickie. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1885.

Anecdota Oxoniensia. Aryan Series. Vol. I, Part V. The Dharma-Samgraha, an ancient collection of Buddhist Technical Terms. Prepared by Kenjin Kasawara, and edited by F. Max Müller and H. Wenzel. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1885.

Anglo-Saxon Dictionary. Based on Groschopp's Grein. Edited, revised and corrected by J. A. Harrison and W. M. Baskervill. New York and Chicago, *A. S. Barnes & Co.*, 1885.

Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik. Herausg. v. Eduard Wölfflin. 2ter Jahrg., Heft 2. Leipzig, *B. Teubner*, 1885.

Arabic Grammar, Paradigms, Literature, Chrestomathy and Glossary. By Dr. A. Socin, Professor in the University of Tübingen (Porta Linguarum Orientalium, inchoavit J. H. Petermann, continuavit H. L. Strack). New York, *B. Westermann & Co.* \$2.60.

Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum. Edita curante Carolo Schenkl. Lipsiae, *Sumptus fecit G. Freytag*, MDCCCLXXXV.

Ciceronis (M. Tulli). *De Officiis Libri Tres.* Ed. Theodorus Schiche. 80 pf.

Orphica. Recensuit Eugenius Abel. Accedunt Procli Hymni, Hymni Magici, Hymna in Isim, aliqua eiusmodi Carmina. 5 m.

Taciti (Cornelii). *De origine, situ, moribus ac populis Germanorum.* Ed. Joannes Müller. 30 pf.

Baebler (J. J.) Beiträge zur Geschichte der lateinischen Grammatik im Mittelalter. Halle, *Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses*, 1885.

Blake (W. W.) Catalogue of the Collections, Historical and Archaeological, of the National Museum of Mexico. Mexico, 1884. 50 cts.

Caesar's Gallic War. Seven Books. Ed. by J. H. and W. F. Allen, and J. B. Greenough. Revised by H. P. Judson. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1885.

Ciceronis (M. Tulli), ad M. Brutum Orator. A revised text, with introductory essays and critical and explanatory notes. By John Edward Sandys. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1885.

Classics for Children. A Primer. By Stickney. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1885.

Davidson (Thomas). The Place of Art in Education. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1885. 24 cts.

De Lattre (A.) L'Asie Occidentale dans les Inscriptions Assyriennes. Extrait de la Revue des Questions Scientifiques. Bruxelles, *A. Vromant*, 1885.

Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18 u. 19 Jahrhunderts, in Neudrucken herausg. von Bernhard Seuffert.

Freundschaftliche Lieder von I. J. Pyra u. S. G. Lange. Heilbronn, *Gebr.*

Henninger, 1885. 1 m. 80 pf.

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ ΘΕΡΕΙΑΝΟΥ. Φιλολογικαὶ Ὑποσημειώσεις. ἐν Τεργέστη παρὰ τῷ βιβλιοπωλεὶ F. H. Schimpff, 1885.

Eichberg (Julius). New High School Music Reader for Mixed Voices. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1885. \$1.05.

Elementary Classics. New York, *Macmillan & Co.* 40 cts.

Caesar. Invasion of Britain. Ed. by W. Welch and C. G. Duffield.

Cicero, de Amicitia. Ed. by E. S. Shuckburgh.

Phaedrus. Select fables. Ed. by A. S. Walpole.

Stories from Roman History. Ed. by G. L. Jeans and A. V. Jones.

Euripides, The Bacchae of. With critical and explanatory notes, and with numerous illustrations from works of ancient art. By John Edward Sandys. Revised edition, with additional illustrations. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1885.

Euripides. Iphigenia in Tauris. Ed. by C. S. Jerram. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*. New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1885. 75 cts.

Fisher (J. L.) Select Bibliography of Ecclesiastical History. (Reprinted from "Methods of Teaching and Studying History.") Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1885.

Gomperz (Th.) Zu Philodem's Büchern von der Musik. Ein kritischer Beitrag. Wien, *Alfred Hölder*, 1885. 1 m. 20 pf.

Gummere (F. B.) A Handbook of Poetics for Students of English Verse. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1885. \$1.10.

Harris (J. Rendel). The Teaching of the Apostles and the Sibylline Books. Cambridge, *H. W. Wallis*, 1885. 2s.

Hoch- u. Niederdeutsches Wörterbuch der mittleren u. neueren Zeit. Zur Ergänzung der vorhandenen Wörterbücher, insbesondere des der Gebrüder Grimm. Von Lorenz Diefenbach u. Ernst Wülcker. Siebente (Schluss-)Lieferung. Basel, *Benno Schwabe*, 1885.

Irving's Rip Van Winkle. Amsterdam edition (on pale green paper and in deep blue ink). New York, *Arthur Hinds*, 1885. 20 cts.

Jahn (Karl). Schulwörterbuch zu G. Andresens Cornelius Nepos. Mit vielen Abbildungen. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*. Prag, *F. Tempsky*, 1886. 1 m. 40 pf.

Körting (P. H.) Geschichte des französischen Romans im XVII Jahrhundert. Lief. 1, 2, 3. Leipzig, *Eugen Franck's Buchhandlung (Georg Maske)*, 1885. @ 2 m.

Krafft und Ranke. Praeparationen für die Schullektüre griechischer u. lateinischer Klassiker. Heft 2. Praeparation zu Ovids Metamorphosen. 50 pf. Heft 3. Praeparation zu Homers Odyssee. Hannover, *Norddeutsche Verlagsanstalt*, 1885. 50 pf.

Lexicon Caesarianum. Confecit H. Mensel. Fasciculus III. Berolini, *H. Weber*, 1885.

Livy, Books XXIII and XXIV. Edited, with introduction and notes, by G. C. Macaulay. London and New York, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1885.

Marlowes Werke. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe von Hermann Breymann

u. Albrecht Wagner. I. Tamburlaine. Herausg. von Albrecht Wagner. Heilbronn, *Gehr. Henninger*, 1885. 4 m.

Mittheilungen des deutschen Archaeologischen Institutes in Athen. Zehnter Band. Zweites Heft. Athen, *Karl Wolberg*, 1885.

Müller (Friedrich). Le Taensa n'a pas été forgé de toutes pièces. Lettre de M. F. M. à Lucien Adam. Paris, *Maisonneuve Frères*, 1885.

Müller (Iwan). Handbuch der klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft. Zweiter Halbband enthaltend: Die 2 Hälfte von Band II. Schluss von der lat. Grammatic u. Stilistik. C. Lexikographie der gr. u. lat. Sprache bearbeitet von Autenrieth und Heerdegen. D. Rhetorik der Griechen u. Römer, von Richard Volkmann. E. Metrik der Griechen und Römer, mit einem Anhang über die Musik der Griechen, von Hugo Gleditsch. Nördlingen, *C. H. Beck*, 1885.

New Testament in the Original Greek. The text revised by Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort. Cambridge and London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1885. \$1.10.

Ovid, Tristia. Book I. The text revised, with an introduction and notes, by S. G. Owen. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1885.

Panaetii et Hecatonis Librorum Fragmenta collegit, praefationibus illustravit H. N. Fowler. (Diss.) Bonnae, 1885.

Pease's Singing Book for High Schools and Colleges. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 80 cts.

Rouse (M. L.) The Number and Nature of the Vowel-Sounds. Toronto, 1885.

Schmidt (C. E.) Parallel-Homer, oder Index aller homerischen Iterati in lexikalischer Anordnung. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht*, 1885.

School Hygiene, Six Lectures on. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1885. 88 cts.

Smyth (H. W.) Der Diphthong EI im Griechischen, unter Berücksichtigung seiner Entsprechungen in verwandten Sprachen. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht*, 1885.

Studia Biblica. Essays in Biblical Archaeology and Criticism and kindred subjects. By Members of the University of Oxford. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1885.

Tregear (Edward). The Aryan Maori. Wellington, *George Disbury*, 1885.

Warren (Minton). On Latin Glossaries. With especial reference to the Codex Sangallensis. Repr. from Trans. of Am. Phil. Assoc., 1884. Cambridge, *John Wilson & Son*, 1885.

Wentworth (G. A.) and Hill (Thomas). A Practical Arithmetic for Grammar Schools. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1885. 85 cts.

Wheeler (B. I.) Der griechische Nominalaccent. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*, 1885.